

Proceedings of the
CANADIAN CLUB, Toronto
for the Year 1912-1913

VOLUME X.

1912-13



THE
A. H. U. COLQUHOUN
LIBRARY
OF CANADIAN HISTORY

~~Can. Hist.~~
2

Proceedings

(ADDRESSES)

DELIVERED BEFORE

The Canadian Club of Toronto

SEASON OF 1912-1913

Edited by the Literary Correspondent



313884
3
27 35

TORONTO:
WARWICK BRO'S & RUTTER, LIMITED
1913

F
5547
T6C33
1912/13

Officers and Executive Committee For 1912-1913

<i>President</i>	<i>1st Vice-President</i>	<i>2nd Vice-President</i>
A. H. U. COLQUHOUN	T. A. RUSSELL	A. H. HEWITT

<i>Hon. Secretary</i>	<i>Hon. Treasurer</i>
LESSLIE WILSON	D. H. GIBSON

<i>Literary Correspondent</i>	<i>Assistant Secretary-Treasurer</i>
F. D. L. SMITH	H. D. SCULLY

Committee

DONALD CAMERON	MAIN JOHNSTON	NORMAN A. WYLIE
G. FRANK BEER	H. L. HOYLES	DR. F. A. CLELAND
E. P. BROWN	J. A. FRASER	K. J. DUNSTAN

Officers and Executive Committee For 1913-1914

<i>President</i>	<i>1st Vice-President</i>	<i>2nd Vice-President</i>
J. R. BONE	DONALD CAMERON	G. FRANK BEER

<i>Hon. Secretary</i>	<i>Hon. Treasurer</i>
LESSLIE WILSON	D. H. GIBSON

<i>Literary Correspondent</i>	<i>Assistant Secretary-Treasurer</i>
F. D. L. SMITH	H. D. SCULLY

Committee

W. C. LAIDLAW	D. B. GILLIES	R. G. DINGMAN
H. L. ROUS	R. R. LOCKHART	T. W. JULL
BEVERLEY ROBINSON	FRANK KENNEDY	A. H. U. COLQUHOUN

CONTENTS

	Page
Officers of Canadian Club, Toronto, 1912-13.....	iii
Officers of Canadian Club, Toronto, 1913-14.....	iii
Report of the Literary Correspondent.....	vii
 A Special Luncheon: TO H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT.....	1
Canada and Imperial Burdens: BY THE RT. HON. WALTER LONG....	7
The Brock Centenary: COL. GEO. T. DENISON AND VISCOUNT MILNER	13
— The Liquor Problem: BY MR. N. W. ROWELL, K.C., M.P.P.....	23 ✓
Panama Canal and Treaty Obligations: BY SIR GEORGE W. ROSS, Kt., LL.D.....	34
Standards: BY HON. S. H. BLAKE, K.C.....	61
Northern Ontario: BY HON. W. H. HEARST, K.C., M.P.P.....	69
— Our Present Duty Towards Toronto's Future: BY MR. R. HOME SMITH.....	81 ✓
— The Relation of Business and Professional Men to Moral and Reli- gious Institutions: BY MR. FRED. B. SMITH.....	89 ✓
Railway Development in Canada: BY MR. A. S. GOODEVE.....	98
The Port of Montreal: BY MR. C. C. BALLANTYNE.....	106
The Everlasting Balkans: BY PROF. L. E. HORNING, PH.D.....	116
— The Progress of Prison Reform: BY HON. W. J. HANNA, M.P.P.....	127
— Scientific Management: BY MR. FREDERICK WINSLOW TAYLOR.....	135
— What Health Work Means: BY DR. W. A. EVANS.....	161 —
The Needs of the University of Toronto: BY SIR EDMUND WALKER, C.V.O., LL.D.....	171
Music for the People: BY MR. ARTHUR FARWELL.....	179
Quebec: Its Early History and Development: BY HON. DR. H. S. BELAND, M.P.....	189
— Municipal Taxation: BY MR. LAWSON PURDY.....	198 ✓
— The Cost of Living: BY MR. C. C. JAMES, C.M.G., LL.D.....	206
Canada and the Navy: BY HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING.....	215
Dr. William Henry Drummond: Poet and Man: BY MR. THOS. O'HAGAN, M.A., PH.D.....	226
The Borden Naval Policy: BY MR. ARTHUR MEIGHEN, M.P.....	234
The Test of a True Democracy: BY VEN. ARCHDEACON CODY.....	242
The Academic Mind in Politics: BY DR. MAURICE HUTTON.....	250 —
Iceland and Canada: BY PROF. W. H. SCHOFIELD.....	262
The Value of Playgrounds to the Community: BY MR. JACOB A. RIIS.	271 ✓

Annual Report of the Literary Correspondent.

The Canadian Club has closed one of the most successful seasons in its history. As indicated by the Honorary Secretary's report, the paid up membership totals 1,255. The average attendance at the 27 luncheons was 250, the greatest number present at any meeting being 425, and the smallest number 125. Of the speakers, 18 were Canadians, 13 citizens of Toronto, and 9 members of this Club. The special luncheon to His Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught, stands out as one of the most interesting and pleasing events of the year. About 400 members were present and probably double that number would have attended had it been possible to find quarters large enough to accommodate them. Unfortunately many applications for seats had to be refused.

F. D. L. SMITH,
Literary Correspondent.

May 1st, 1913.

THE CANADIAN CLUB OF TORONTO

ADDRESSES 1912-13

A Special Luncheon.

TO HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS, THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT, GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF CANADA.

HIS Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught, was graciously pleased to be the Club's guest at a special luncheon held in the King Edward Hotel, on Monday, October 21st.

Amongst the other guests present were: Viscount Milner, His Honour, Sir John M. Gibson, K.C.M.G., Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, Sir James Whitney, Mr. N. W. Rowell, K.C., Bishop Sweeny, Hon. Dr. R. A. Pyne, Sir Edmund Walker, Col. H. C. Lowther, Major Caldwell, Mr. J. S. Willison, Sir Henry Pellatt, Sir George W. Ross, Mayor Geary, Sir Thomas Lipton, Mr. Æmilius Jarvis, Major Neill, Mr. D. R. Wilkie, Mr. R. S. Gourlay and Mr. T. A. Russell.

At the conclusion of the luncheon, the President, Dr. A. H. U. Colquhoun, gave the toast to the King which was enthusiastically drunk. The President then said:—

"This is in one sense an ordinary meeting of the Canadian Club, but it will always be one of the most notable in our annals. We deeply appreciate the kindness of His Royal Highness in gracing our gathering with his presence. We regret that no dining room could be found in this city sufficiently large to contain one half its members who desired to unite in this loyal Canadian welcome. There is nothing more remarkable in history than this growth of the underlying feeling in all our Dominions that strengthens, not weakens,

the ties of Empire, because they feel that above all other things the Crown is the link that binds all the members of the Empire together. In our illustrious guest we recognize a member of the Royal House to which our allegiance is fully and freely given. In your name, and on your behalf, I convey to His Royal Highness this loyal Canadian welcome. And you know very well how heart-whole and sincere that greeting is." (Applause.)

The President then called on Mr. J. S. Willison to propose the health of His Royal Highness. Mr. Willison said:

"Your Royal Highness, Your Honor, Mr. President, and Gentlemen,—Throughout all the history of this Confederation we have been fortunate in the men chosen to fill the office of Governor-General. There was not one of all the group who did not govern in the spirit of the Constitution, who drifted into undesirable conflict with Canadian Ministers or who misinterpreted the sentiment of Canada. We have gone a long journey since this Confederation was organized nearly half a century ago—a long journey in material progress, in national cohesion and in the evolution of the Empire. It is significant that just in proportion as national feeling has strengthened and deepened the sense of devotion to the Mother Country and of satisfaction with the Imperial relation has become more active, more robust and more universal. I venture to suggest that in the continuous and harmonious co-operation and combination of national feeling with Imperial sentiment lies the stability and the security of the whole Imperial structure.

"Nowhere has this conception of the Imperial connection and of the long future of the Empire been expressed in more felicitous language, with truer fidelity to the nationalism of the Dominions, with more of the faith and conviction of Imperial prophecy than in the addresses which the Governor-General has delivered throughout Canada.

"Now, Sir, I shall not be presumptuous enough to attempt any laborious estimate of the qualities and achievements of His Royal Highness. Nor shall I attempt any display of rhetoric. We suffer much from orators in these days, and where such infinite patience is displayed some mercy should be shown. (Laughter.) It is enough, therefore, to say that in the conduct of his office and in all his relations with the Canadian people the Governor-General has borne himself with the dignity of a Prince, the sympathy of a democrat, and the fine courtesy of an English gentleman. It is enough to say that he is very conscious of our virtues, very tender with our convictions, and very patient with our prejudices, and where

prejudice ends and conviction begins is one of the supreme problems of human philosophy. It is enough to say that in all his counsel, restrained and reticent though it be, he has emphasized what John Morley has called 'the old and great sentences of morals.'

"And finally it is enough to say that recognizing the Throne as the supreme bond of Empire and the Royal House to which he belongs as peculiarly devoted to simplicity of living, to service and sacrifice for the common welfare, to the preservation of peace amongst the nations and to the prosecution of all the good ends of civilization, we rejoice that as he has gone from East to West in Canada, over immense leagues of territory under the flag, he has found only manifestations of respect for himself and only evidences of a healthy and happy union between this free Canadian democracy and the ancient monarchy across the seas." (Applause.)

Upon rising to respond the Duke of Connaught was received with prolonged applause. His Royal Highness said:

"*Mr. President, Your Honor, and Gentlemen*,—I am very sensible of the kind manner in which you have received the toast to my health. I desire to thank the President for the kind way he introduced it, and Mr. Willison for the very touching way in which he proposed it.

"I am indeed very grateful to have this opportunity of meeting you all here to-day, and I can assure you it is a matter of real pleasure to be amongst you on this occasion.

"You will excuse me if I am rather hoarse, but I will do the best I can.

"Gentlemen, I hope I may consider myself no longer a stranger in Toronto. I have had great pleasure in being amongst you on several previous occasions, and I need not tell you how pleased I have been to come again to this city, to meet the Canadian Club. You have received me with a cordiality and a sincere feeling which has touched me most deeply. And I shall always remember the sincere cordiality of the people of Toronto. (Cheers.)

"You, Sir, have referred to the long tour which it has been my pleasure to make throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. In this tour I have traveled about ten thousand miles, and have spent the best part of three months. This tour has been one full of interest to me. It has given me an insight into the great questions affecting this vast Dominion. It has enabled me to learn what the different people are doing and saying on different subjects, and I have come away full of the conviction that there is not a more

loyal body of people in the British Empire than the Canadian people.

"Of course, Canada is a democratic country, but it is none the worse for that. We are living in a democratic age. But what a good thing it is when a democratic country remains attached to the old traditions of the country from which its people came. (Cheers.) The problem of retaining those feelings, and standing true to them while yet moving with the times, is one of the important questions of the day.

"Gentlemen, I felt, as I traveled these vast distances of your territory and saw the development of your country and those towns growing from nothing to large important cities, that those men who had been the means of creating these towns, people from Eastern Canada, settlers from the United Kingdom, and sometimes even from Dominions beyond the seas, were one and all imbued with the one idea; that idea was the future prosperity of Canada. I feel confident that with this faith so strong in them, the future of this great Dominion is assured. I feel sure that with that energy, that zeal for hard work, which appears characteristic of all living in the Dominion, this great country will go on increasing in importance, in wealth, and in prosperity.

"Gentlemen, there is one thing that struck me, and it is a very important one; that is, the importance of the education of the young at the present moment. It is in the proper and sympathetic education of the youth of the Dominion that the future of the country lies. I was particularly struck in the West with the great interest taken in education. Wherever I went, and happened to ask, 'What fine building is that?' I was told it was a school. When I enquired in different provinces for what purpose money was chiefly being spent, the answer was, the education of the young. Gentlemen, I feel this is an important question, and one in which you will, I am sure, all sympathize with me. I venture to urge it in the strongest manner possible. I am afraid the West is taking many of the best teachers away from the East. I hope the East will be able to replace them from the Old Country, for we are all one, we speak one language, we are one in our aspirations, our liberty, our respect for law. Gentlemen, if these are the feelings of the people of Canada, as well as of those of the Old Country, you should not have much difficulty in replacing Canadian with English teachers when they move on to the West.

"There was one other thing that struck me: It was that so great was the interest of the people in the country generally.

that they were only too ready to make their political views subservient to the welfare of Canada. Politics are a necessity in our system of government, a right necessity, but there are moments when politics must be made subservient to the good of the country and the prosperity of its people. (Cheers.)

"Gentlemen, I heard, before I went to the West, that I might find a feeling of antagonism to the East. I am happy to say I did not find it in a single instance. Nothing gave me greater pleasure than to find that one and all felt the same, and wherever I went, whether in the Maritime Provinces, Quebec, Ontario, or in the Western Provinces, there was a strong, united, Canadian feeling. With this before us, I am sure Canada, under the flag that flies over us, will be the great country I wish to see it.

"I am certain of this, and all those who come from the Old Country will bear me out, especially those who have recently visited it, that that vigorous, strong sense of national spirit in Canada is something we rejoice to see. (Cheers.)

"I am happy to see sitting next me on this occasion a distinguished English statesman,* one who has done a great deal for the Empire, and I am certain I am only expressing the feelings of all Canadians when I say that we are only too pleased to see amongst us those who have done great service to the State. Gentlemen, I think it is a wonderful thing when I see the vast numbers of different nationalities now living under the British flag in this great Dominion, to find that they are one and all being gradually welded into true Canadians. And I am sure those in authority are very much to be praised for the way in which they have set themselves by example and by universal education to harmonize these different races into one Canadian people.

"I was pleased too, and astonished, in different parts of the Dominion, to see large numbers of old soldiers of the Empire, men of good character, who have been taught discipline, and who have faced dangers, both in war and in peace,—to find them represented here in Canada, happy to live in the Dominion, doing well, and respecting their Canadian fellow subjects. Gentlemen, I congratulate you on having such an asset in this country. You have now comparatively more old soldiers in Canada than we have at home. I am sure they will be a great help to the country. Wherever I went, veteran societies came to welcome me, the men wearing medals on their breasts, some known to me personally, others who knew me better than I knew them, but all were imbued with the idea of doing well and helping Canada. (Cheers.)

*Viscount Milner.

"Another thing which pleased me much,—and it is not a controversial subject,—was the Boy Scout Movement. As you know I am the Chief Scout of Canada, so naturally all scouts appeal to me. I honestly think that in the Scout Movement we have a great educational force, which improves the morale, the physique, and the good conduct of the boys of the country. Since I have been out here, and accepted that position, there have been at least twenty cases where I have given certificates of honor to boys who have risked their lives to save their fellows. Gentlemen, a movement that produces such a result is to be encouraged. I am only delighted to know that the Scout Movement has come to stay in Canada. It has a great educational value improving boys, and making them better every way.

"Gentlemen, I am indeed gratified at this opportunity of meeting you. I am well aware of the great influence for good exercised by the Canadian Clubs throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. Therefore to me personally it is always the deepest pleasure to come amongst you as on this occasion, to meet men of all professions, all shades of politics, all religious persuasions, who one and all are promoting the interests of Canada. I thank you for the honor you have done me in receiving me amongst you to-day, on my return from my long and interesting tour, and to express my hearty thanks for the very kind reception you have given me." (Prolonged cheers.)

(September 30th, 1912.)

Canada and Imperial Burdens

BY THE RIGHT HON. WALTER LONG.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club held on the 30th Sept., 1912, Mr. Long said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—Your chairman in his opening remarks reminded you that I am a Parliamentarian. I have been one, for more years than I care to remember. I suppose that always the lot of a Parliamentarian has been to make speeches, and I have had the opportunity of making a good many since I have been in the Dominion; and I am not surprised to find that here and there voices of criticisms have been raised at some things I may have said or left unsaid. I have no apology to offer for anything I have ever said in my public life either in the Old Land or in this great Dominion. I have only this to say: I have endeavored through all my life, and have followed the rule here in this country, to say earnestly what I think, to put my opinions honestly, fully, frankly, before those who have done me the honor to listen to me, to speak my mind honestly, and to avoid, if possible, giving offence to those who differ from me in the views I hold.

What is the task, what is the burden, that you and I have to face? What is the Empire to which you and I belong? This Empire, gentlemen, has been the creation of centuries; the marvellous fabric we contemplate with so much pride to-day has been built up by the tender care, the devoted labor, the splendid courage of our forefathers, who had to face a task far greater, far more difficult than the one that is presented to you and to me. The Empire which we own, of which we are thankful and proud to be citizens, has no equal; there is no precedent for it to be found in the world's history. It covers all parts of the globe, it comprises many millions of subjects; it is bound together by no chains of steel; it is held by no prisoners' fetters, it is bound by bonds of love for the Mother Land which was the origin of all our Overseas Dominions, and which has through all these ages, I think you will admit, given liberally both of her sons and of her money, in order

* The Right Honorable Walter Long was a member of the last Balfour Cabinet and will have a foremost place in the next Unionist Government. He is the leader of the old Conservative wing of his party.

that her Empire may grow and may be stronger and be better able to do its work in the future.

Gentlemen, I say it has no precedent. We who belong to the Home Land thankfully acknowledge to-day that the different parts of it are free, if they so desire, to make what decisions they like as to the future of that part of the Empire in which they live. I am thankful to be able to say, that whether I draw upon my experience of gatherings like this or similar, or from private conversations in the club, on the street, in the railway train, or on the tram cars, the result is the same. I find throughout Canada, from north to south, from east to west, prevailing in the whole land, a unanimous sentiment and it is one of deep and profound loyalty to the King and the Constitution and devotion to the Mother Land, the Empire, and that part in which you live here, accompanied by a steadfast determination to bear your share in the burdens which Imperial citizenship brings in its train.

What then are these burdens? The burden that falls upon us citizens of the Empire is to bear upon our shoulders the great Empire that others have created. I hope that it may in the Providence of God be never the fact that other countries will endeavor to wrest from us the possessions which we hold to-day; but it is true to-day, as it ever was, if you want peace you should be prepared for war; and it is true to-day, as it ever was, that if you mean to be successful in war, you must make your preparations in times of peace. Eyes of jealousy, possibly even of enmity, have been cast upon the British Empire. Her free peoples, her glorious lands, her splendid unrivalled possessions, have not failed to make the people of other lands look with a longing to have some share in these vast possessions. What is our answer going to be? Are we going to say we are strong enough to-day to bear this burden? Are we going to say to-day that a free people, of their own choice and will, answer they are determined to keep for themselves that which their fathers have won? I have no doubt as to the part which our people will play.

Our burden is to protect our Empire. Like the human body, it is most liable to assault and injury at its heart. We know there is a possibility—may it never be more than that!—that an assault might be made upon that heart of the Empire. Do not, I beg of you, be led to believe any of the more cowardly or more thoughtless among us who say that in the Mother Land there is any weakening of our determination to stand up and protect our own. If—as I hope will not be the case, if—as I am confident will not be the case,—if our Over-

seas Dominions should turn to the Mother Land and tell her they have chosen to work out their own destiny, that in days gone by she has not given enough thought, attention, sympathy and care to her growing Overseas Dominions, and now must face her burden alone,—if that evil day should come, the Mother Land will not shrink from her burden, heavy though it should be. But, gentlemen, that day has never come; it is never going to dawn! If any passing danger—I assume there could be nothing greater than that—should come up on the horizon, the lands Overseas would notice it, and would tell her she must wake up and do her duty, and they are determined to do theirs alongside of her.

The difficulty that presents itself at the moment is of a dual character: there is the immediate duty of the moment, and the duty of the future. For my part, I hope with all my heart that our Overseas Dominions will tell the Mother Country that they are prepared first of all to give her that immediate assistance which will be worth more, far more, than any gift, more far than the ships which will be the product of that gift,—for it will mean that to all the world will go out the cry, “If you believe the Empire of Great Britain is in danger, this is the answer her sons make: if you believe she is weaker, her sons will rally around her and will tell you she is not weaker, but is a thousand times stronger to-day, that she is able to rely not only on her own arm, but on her sons who are prepared to sacrifice themselves if need be in defence of the Empire of which they are citizens, and which they love as much as the oldest residents in the Old Mother Land.

But, gentlemen, it is not only our duty to protect what we have, to see that our navy is large enough and efficient enough for its work, to see that in addition to any momentary arrangements we lay our plans well and securely for the future regarding defence; it is also our duty to do something of the work of creation. These great Overseas Dominions have been brought into existence and to splendid maturity by the statesmanship, the wisdom, the self-denial of our predecessors; they could not do everything, we have our part to do. There are our products, the different articles, both raw and manufactured. It has always been to me, I won't say a dream, but a deep-seated desire, that the day should come, and rapidly, when we, the men of to-day, should form a working plan by which the Empire shall become self-supporting. Why should not we exchange on terms of friendly dealing the products of the lands over which the Union Jack flies? If we have

common share in defence, why not in supplying the common necessities of our people? An opportunity greater than any other empire in the world presents is offered to us; it rests upon us to take advantage of it. If I might be permitted to say so, the plan, I think, which should be adopted is that we should have with as little delay as possible, a real working conference with a view to exchange of products among the various portions of the Empire. I think you will forgive me when I say that I think when such a conference is held no door should be bolted, no door should be barred; I think it should be held with open doors on all sides, where there should be plans formed that we shall have a working arrangement not only to defend the Empire, but also to extend the opportunities within the Empire before it has to look outside of it for the necessities for its people, I hope the time is not far distant when we may approach this question with the determination to solve it. The task, I know, is a heavy one. I know there are many difficulties to be overcome. But I assume you remember what was the task at the Confederation of Canada; was not that a very heavy one? Were there not great difficulties to be overcome? Yet that task was faced, and magnificently was the work accomplished. Those difficulties you realized, and you disposed of them. Surely to-day we can begin by realizing that there are difficulties and differences of opinion, and then set ourselves, not to fight each other, but to unite when we may for the solution of these problems, the dispersion of these difficulties, so that the British Empire shall be united not only in defence but in trade. I believe then that these two great tasks are presented to us, and I believe that we shall find the solution for them.

I said earlier in my remarks to you that throughout my travels in Canada I had found everywhere a steadfast determination on the part of the British citizens living in this part of the British Empire to do their share and to bear their part of the Imperial burden. I do not mean to say that I found Canadians to be loyal. I had not to come to Canada to know that. Canadian loyalty is known all over the world; no visitor has to come here to find out that Canadians are loyal. But there is a great difference between what we call loyalty and what we call the Imperial sentiment. I suppose there is no country in the world where men are more absorbed in their own affairs, in making their living, in seeking to be successful. Every town is busy, and in the country districts those engaged in farming are every day absorbed in trying to solve the problems they are occupied with; yet it is an interesting and

remarkable fact, to find that notwithstanding the burdens that private business lays upon every man, they have had time, and I often wonder how they find it, to look at these Imperial problems for themselves. They have come to realize that the Empire is a solid reality, and that they must take their share in the meaning of it.

If I am right, the path is not so difficult as it would seem; if the men of Canada realize the work facing them to-day, if they are determined to do it with all their strength and energy, half the task is accomplished before it is begun. If I am right, then nobody need despair or doubt as to the future of our great Empire. If I am right, you may depend upon it, we will all say to the Mother Country that the citizens of to-day are going to prove themselves worthy sons of this great Empire. And surely we should be unworthy of our citizenship if we were not moved to the very depths of our heart when we stop to think of the Empire as to its possibilities; and if so, how can we refuse to do our share, which, if we don't do it, will be left undone? This Empire cannot become a great and powerful organization, united in one strong and reliant whole, on mere resources; for after all the Empire is like an army or a navy or a business organization, its real strength and power does not come into play unless it is thoroughly organized from top to bottom. We have power and influence, but we have to-day to organize ourselves for the business of Imperial defence. This task falls upon us, upon the shoulders of the men of to-day. Gentlemen, I am very hopeful; I have always been an optimist; I have never despaired of our country or of its future; but my visit to your Dominion has made me still more optimistic, more confident, more hopeful. You have given us a glorious lead; it is for us to follow, to take the hand you have held out, and join with you in the solution of this great problem of Imperial defence.

I believe before the British Empire there is a prospect which it almost makes one dizzy to think of. As we remember what our possibilities are, what the possibilities of Canada alone are, what room you have here in the one Province of Ontario, where you have land to which you can extend your development, and can offer a home and prospects of a happy future to—may I say without exaggeration?—millions of newcomers; and this is only one province of those that make up your great Dominion;—your visitor facing these facts for the first time with his own eyes, is made almost dizzy with the contemplation. It is for you and me to make the best of these opportunities.

I came by accident across some lines which I had never seen before, but which struck me as being wonderfully indicative of the spirit of Canada. They are very short, and in my last words let me read them to you:

Dear Canada, should occasion call
Thy sons to die in Freedom's strife,
Like thine own maple leaves they'd fall,
More glorious e'en in death than life.

That seems to me to preach the true spirit of Canadian patriotism and Imperialism, and to give what is the keynote of the character of the great part of the nation which is resident in Canada. And we of the other parts of the Empire are proud to realize that it is full of men such as are described there. We are willing and thankful to re-echo the words, relying as we do on men inspired by these high ideals, animated by this splendid Imperial enthusiasm, who will bear their burden, and do their share of the work. They and their children will find that the British Empire is to-day ten times stronger than it has ever been throughout all its glorious history.

(October 14th, 1912.)

The Brock Centenary

BY COL. GEORGE T. DENISON AND VISCOUNT MILNER.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club, held on the 14th October, 1912, Col. Denison said:

Mr. Chairman, My Lord, and brother members of the Club,—It is with great pleasure that I take advantage of this opportunity of saying a few words on behalf of our great national hero. I do not propose giving you any account in detail of the battle of Queenston Heights; it has been done carefully and well in all the press through the past few days. But I would like to take up a point which I think of the very greatest importance to the Canadian people, and which I think should be understood clearly and well by all our people; and that is, the exact condition of affairs in this country on the opening of that war. No one can form any proper or correct impression of the greatness of Brock's character, unless he understands fully the conditions under which he lived, the difficulties he faced, the apathy that blocked his path. I want to let you understand exactly what those conditions were in this country.

General Simcoe came here in 1792. He had with him a number of the United Empire Loyalists, loyal fighting men of the Revolution, who had abandoned their homes in the United States, and had settled in different spots along the frontier, in Glengarry, a few around Kingston, a good many around the Bay of Quinte and around Toronto, a good many on the Niagara frontier, and a few in the county of Norfolk, and westerly. One of the most distinguished families of those who settled in Norfolk is represented here with us to-day, I am glad to see, in my friend Col. Ryerson.

When these Loyalists had been here ten or twelve years, and had got homes for themselves in the wilderness, Governor Simcoe was anxious to get more population in this province,

* Colonel George Taylor Denison needed no introduction to his fellow members of the Canadian Club. Joseph Chamberlain excepted, he has done more than any other man living for the Imperial cause now so dear to the hearts of Canadians. This was the opinion expressed by Lord Milner two or three years ago, and thinking men echo it. Viscount Milner himself is an old friend of the Canadian Club as was indicated by the exceptionally warm welcome extended to him on this occasion.

and he tried to do so by offering very favorable land regulations. Now the Loyalists who had not already left the States knew that if they came they would get first class advantages in these land laws, and this opportunity brought many to this country. But unfortunately, while there were a great many who were anxious to live under monarchical conditions, there were some who were of a different character, and only wanted to take advantage of the opportunity of getting land on the very advantageous terms offered in Upper Canada, because here we were perfectly free of Indian troubles such as had been worrying settlers in the United States. As a result, a large number of people came here who were really not sympathetic with the monarchical cause, but came here simply to get land. Now anyone who would understand the condition of affairs in which Brock found himself must remember this fact. Fortunately Simcoe, at the very first start of his government, in 1793, had a Militia Law passed. It was amended in 1794. Under this law, everyone between the ages of fifteen and fifty had to turn out to drill; under the amended provision the ages were sixteen to sixty. Every man was obliged to turn out at least two days every year for parade; and he might—the captain could order and compel him to drill for four days. And the most curious condition of all was that every boy of sixteen had to be enrolled within six months after attaining that age, and had to present himself on parade with a rifle, musket, or shotgun, something as a weapon, and each one had to have at least six rounds of ball ammunition for practice. When you consider that every boy of sixteen had to get a gun and appear with it on parade or be heavily fined—though the captain of his company, if satisfied the boy or his relatives could not afford it, could give him a certificate so that he would not be fined—this seems a very stringent law. But of course it was in a sense fair, for it served as a tax, without keeping any accounts; because every man had to do it; it served the purpose of a tax; there was no reason why a man should not do it, because every one had to do it. And you must remember, gentlemen, that Act was passed by the old soldier-farmers of this country, who fought in the Revolutionary War; they had put this burden upon themselves and their children. And I think that that Act, on the statute books of our country, stands as a great monument to the national spirit of our fathers.

Now, that was the condition of affairs as relates to the militia. The population of Upper Canada in 1812 was estimated at from seventy up to eighty thousand—I have seen

the number stated as seventy-seven thousand. Of those of the ages from sixteen to sixty there were really about eleven thousand able-bodied men capable of bearing arms, but in the districts I have mentioned, the forces able to fight, according to Dr. Canniff, numbered some nine thousand. General Brock had a force of fifteen hundred regular troops, and there were about three thousand in Lower Canada. But he was short of arms; he lacked munitions of war; these were all distributed; he lacked money; there was no specie in the country; and the English Government was hardly able to do anything to help him. These are things that people do not usually remember. We talk of the great victories of Wellington in the Peninsula: certainly we did have victories, and came out on top; but the English for many years were engaged in a life and death struggle against the greatest soldier and strategist, I suppose, the world has ever seen; and the armies of Europe were practically under his control. Look at the early part of the Peninsular War: you remember, that in 1809 the French drove Sir John Moore to Corunna; he had to embark his army and go back to England; in 1810 Wellington had to fall back on his lines at Torres Vedras, where he was protected by his fortresses and by his fleet alongside; in 1811 he was obliged to retreat to the Portuguese frontier; in 1812, even after the battle of Salamanca, he was obliged to retreat from Burgos; the English were struggling; everything was going hard, and all was uncertain, unsettled. Even the battle of Salamanca could not have encouraged Brock, for he could hardly have heard of it in his lifetime; it was fought in August, and it would have taken six weeks or two months for him to get news of it, as in those days it took so long to send communications.

That was the state of affairs in Europe at the time. The English population was double then what we have in Canada to-day, about sixteen million. In the fight with Napoleon they increased their National Debt from £250,000,000 to £750,000,000—they increased it by £500,000,000! And that with a small country of sixteen million people! They placed that burden upon themselves and upon their posterity, to preserve the freedom of the British Empire for themselves and for us! That is a great thing to think about. When you have a people that will undertake a burden of £750,000,000—and that is between \$3,000,000,000 and \$4,000,000,000,—it will give you some idea what our fathers and statesmen were willing to do for the freedom of Great Britain.

But just imagine what the statesmen must have thought, with their armies checked in the Peninsula, their debt accumulating, and consequently the impossibility of sending soldiers out here. Brock knew that; he knew the condition of his forces here, in the few little scattered settlements along the frontier. Toronto could not then turn out, as you know, a garrison parade such as it did yesterday, for its whole population was somewhere about eight hundred inhabitants. It was a mere village, but here was Brock with his Parliament House and his Government in this little village. Along the Niagara River there was a small settlement, and, as I have already told you, in the county of Norfolk. But behind that little fringe of population there was the illimitable wilderness stretching to the North Pole.

That was the condition of affairs in this country that Brock had to deal with. And in front of him was a nation of eight million people, who did actually put under arms and under the colors 471,000 militia, and over 30,000 in their regular army during the war. That was what he had to face in front.

But, gentlemen, he had more difficulties than that. These later settlers, these newcomers under the arrangements of Gov. Simcoe, were not all loyal, they were not all true, some of them intrigued to check Brock. He called his Parliament in February, 1812, and tried to get the Habeas Corpus Act suspended, to enable him to deal with traitors; but the vote was lost by a majority of two. Then he tried to get an Act passed of Abjuration, but he could not manage that. And so the House prorogued with nothing done. But when war broke out—it was declared on the 18th of June—and you remember that on the 12th of June Napoleon crossed the Niemen with 500,000 picked troops on his march to Moscow. He was then at the climax of his strength. The Austrian, Prussian, Italian and Holland armies were all under his control. That was the condition so far as that was concerned. But when Hull with 2,500 men on the 12th of July crossed into Canada, and issued a proclamation inviting the Canadians to join his standard, he got five hundred militia of this Western district to give in their adhesion to him. Many Canadians do not know that; it is something we do not like to dwell on, we are not proud of it; but these men were not loyal, and went over to Hull. In other places, there were some people, and some of them in Norfolk, who were quite disloyal, and refused to act under their officers. All that news was coming in to Brock, and made it hard for him, under those conditions,

here in this little village. He heard about the emissaries and traitors who were going through the country trying to spread doubt and hesitation among his people.

He called his Parliament together to help him. They met in this city on the 27th July, 1812, and he spoke to them. He asked them for legislation to help him, the repeal of the Habeas Corpus Act, the Oath of Abjuration Bill, and one or two other things. What happened? Under the leadership of Willcocks and Marcle, and some others, the House was timid, and Brock was unable to get anything done. But in one or two days—on the second day after his speech to the House—I cannot tell you this as fact, one must judge from the circumstances—but probably finding out the feeling of the House, he ordered on the 29th of July, two days after the House met, a parade of the volunteers of this district, the County of York, about four hundred in number. He made them a speech. He said he wanted to know how many were willing to follow him, in this province or out of it, and asked such to step to the front. The whole four hundred of the York men stepped to the front! And gentlemen, you will excuse me when I say it, I am proud to say that every able-bodied man of my family in those days was in that force. That was one of the most important little incidents that happened. For that decisive, loyal backing up that these men gave to Brock counted for much, he found the men of this little village and outskirts on his side. He waited day after day for his Parliament to help him, but they were doing nothing, they were wasting time, talking, in fact, eight days about the repealing of a clause in the School Bill. To a man of Brock's wonderful energy and impetuosity that was most trying. I can imagine how he must have felt. He waited until the 3rd of August, then he prepared a minute to be read to his Council—a little council of five or six men, United Empire Loyalists. That record, I may perhaps read to you, for I do not think you will find it in any book of history. It was discovered by Col. Cruikshank in the Archives twenty years ago, and it is casually referred to in Tupper's history. This minute, which he laid before his Council, gives a vivid picture of his difficulties.

He says:

That the House of Assembly, instead of prompt exertions to strengthen his hands for the government of the militia, providing for security from internal treason by the partial suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, authorizing a partial exercise of martial law con-

currently with the ordinary course of justice, and placing at his disposal the funds not actually applied of the past appropriation, had consumed eight days in carrying a single measure of party, the repeal of the School Bill, and passing an Act for the public disclosure of treasonable practices before the magistrates should have the power to commit without bail. (They could not put a man in prison till they had told all about it, so every other traitor might know!) That under these circumstances little could be expected from a prolonged session. The enemy had invaded and taken post in the Western district, was multiplying daily his preparations to invade in others. That the militia in a perfect state of insubordination, had withdrawn from the ranks in actual service, had refused to march when legally commanded, to reinforce a detachment of regular forces for the relief of Amherstburg, had insulted their officers, and some not immediately embodied had manifested in many instances a treasonable spirit of mutiny and disaffection. That the Indians on Grand River, tampered with by disaffected whites, had withdrawn their volunteer services, and declared for a neutrality, which was equally inadmissible as with the King's other subjects. That in the Western and London districts several persons had negotiated with the enemy's commander, hailing his arrival and pledging their support. That the King's forces consisted of the 41st, 900 strong, part of the Royal Newfoundland, 200, with a detachment of Royal Artillery and several vessels. That the extent of coast and distance of prominent parts would divide that force to support and countenance the militia. That the conduct of the Western militia had exposed the regulars at Amherstburg and he had made a large detachment of the 41st with militia from the Home and Niagara districts. That the Commandant at St. Joseph's had taken Mackinac, and might descend to Amherstburg and compel the invaders to retreat, with the aid of the detachment now on the march to Longue Point, but that no good result could be expected unless he had power to restrain the militia and general population from treasonable adherence to the enemy, or neutrality, by summary procedure—asked—whether it would be expedient to prorogue the House of Assembly and proclaim martial law?

The council adjourned until the next day for consideration, and then decided to prorogue the House and declare martial law. He held he had power to do that under his commission from his King. On the 5th of August that was done. But before it was done there was a splendid ringing appeal to the people of Canada, appealing to their loyalty, issued by the House—because, fortunately, the traitors must have disappeared, knowing this thing was going to be done. Willcocks, Mallroy and Marcle, and many disloyal men, deserted to the enemy's forces. Willcocks was killed in the battle of Fort Erie in 1814, commanding a regiment in the Yankee army. Marcle became a major in the same regiment as Willcocks. But when Brock had power, had martial law, and was in command, he was able to stop that kind of thing; those who were loyal came over to him, and those that had wanted to be neutral were won over to be adherents, while those who were hostile and did not want to become adherents were put into prison. And I want to say this, which is known as a fact, that on that day, when Brock died, one hundred years ago, at the head of 190 men at Queenston Heights, he had left in the jail and the court house in Niagara, three hundred traitors and aliens in prison, under the guard of sixty old men and invalids who were able to keep them in subjection while the others went to the battle of Queenston Heights.

Can anybody, knowing that, and understanding the position Brock was in, have any other feeling but be lost in admiration at the bravery, the pluck, the determination shown by him, in taking into his own hands the control of affairs, and doing exactly the right thing at the right time? It was announced that any people wishing to leave Canada might do so, but if they stayed here after the 1st of January, 1813, and were not serving in the militia, they would be tried as spies and put to death. Seven of those men were hanged at Ancaster.

On the 6th of August, Brock started for Detroit, taking with him about one hundred of the York Volunteers, of the Flank Companies. During the whole spring Brock had done a great deal to strengthen his forces by means of those companies. He directed that two of these Flank Companies were to be formed for every regiment, and they were to drill six days in each month, for which they got no pay, and no uniforms. They were ordered to provide themselves with some sort of short jacket or coat, and a round hat; that was all their uniform. Nearly one-fourth of their time was given up to drill, for nothing. They knew it, they volunteered for it, and they did it! Brock writing to Gen. Prevost said there was

a splendid spirit in the militia; while some were not loyal, yet the great body of those in the country were as staunch as they could be, as was shown by these Flank Companies, who were serving without pay, and doing it voluntarily.

When Brock defeated Gen. Hull, and made him surrender, he obtained quite a stock of arms, which enabled him when he came back to arm a good many of his men. But unfortunately Sir George Prevost had made an armistice, or Brock, I believe, would have cleaned up the country along the Niagara frontier. He afterwards went up to Queenston Heights, leading his men, and won that battle. But it is not the fact of his dying there, not the fact of the victory our people won then, that has made that event have such a deep hold upon the Canadian people. When I was a young man, the old friends of our family were all veterans of the war, for it was quite as recent to us in those days as the Fenian Raid is to us now. Those men felt that it was Brock's determination in dissolving the House and declaring martial law, and in taking out the fighting men to defend this country, that was the reason why our fathers conquered. And I hope, if there should come in the future any time when this country should be in danger, we shall have as good a man as Brock to lead us. There is something peculiar about the British race: when a crisis comes, you generally see some Englishman, or some Scotchman, or some Irishman, stepping up and doing the right thing at the right time. Such a man was Nicholson, who lost his life in the Mutiny at Delhi. And I am glad to say that another great Proconsul of Britain is in the room with us, in the person of Lord Milner. You all know how in South Africa he was the right man in the right place. And I hope that will go on. I hope if ever in the future we have danger the right man will be at the head, and he will be if we have as good a man as Brock.

The final paragraph in his speech to the House on opening it on the 27th July, 1812, carries a great lesson to us all. He said:

We are engaged in an awful and eventful contest. By unanimity and despatch in our Councils, and by vigour in our operations we may teach the enemy this lesson, that a country defended by free men, enthusiastically devoted to the cause of their King and Constitution can never be conquered.

Lord Milner, being asked by the president to propose a vote of thanks, said:

Mr. Chairman, Col. Denison, and Gentlemen:

I did not come here intending to make a speech, and I know I shall get into trouble for making, not a speech, but the few remarks which I propose to address to you; because I have been invited to speak to Canadian Clubs in other places, but have uniformly refused, saying that this is a private visit I am on, and I am not intending to make any addresses. However, I think the most cantankerous critic will admit that I have been put to-day in a position in which it would not have been possible for me to decline to make these few remarks.

I esteem it a very great privilege to have happened by accident to be in Toronto just the very day, or rather the day before Col. Denison was about to address you on the subject of Brock. The moment I heard of the proposed address, I felt that I could not lose the opportunity of listening to it, because not only is Brock one of the great heroes of English history, but one of the least generally appreciated. Certainly he is very well known in Canada, but not half as well through Great Britain or other parts of the British Empire as he ought to be.

I should be glad any time to join in any tribute to the memory of so great a man, but I was specially attracted by the thought that I should have the privilege of hearing his praises from the mouth of a man who is perhaps more than any other man living qualified to speak his praises and appreciate his struggles. I am sure that there was not one of those three or four hundred men who stepped forward, among whom his ancestors were known, who was not animated by the same kind of patriotic spirit, which we have learned to admire in the speaker of to-day. I do not know any man in the British Empire better qualified to give us an account of what Brock really did, and to analyze the merit of his great achievement, which was not merely a military victory, for he was not only a great commander—he was more than that, a great patriot and a great statesman.

And, gentlemen, in voting a unanimous measure of thanks to Col. Denison, you will all most gladly accord him the warmest possible vote of thanks for the interesting address he has made us to-day, all the more interesting because he has not followed the beaten track of laudation of Brock's victory, but because he has given us an insight into some of the very peculiar conditions with which he was confronted, conditions such, I think, as none of us have paid attention to, and certainly were never realized by myself until just now.

He has given us interesting and instructive details of that great career, and made some very illuminating references to the conditions of the Empire at the time when that great struggle took place. I think it has been said by every competent historian that the war in which Brock fell was in the first place unnecessary, and in the second place unfortunate, and one in which the result was disappointing to both parties, Great Britain and the United States, and that we have not loved to dwell upon these details. I think in the main that is true. But one compensating feature about that war was what it did for the national spirit of Canada. It was in a sense the beginning of Canadian history, as we think of Canadian history nowadays, and it was certainly a grand beginning, a great memory and a great tradition, that a people so small as Canada's population was at that time, a people so untrained, taken by surprise as they were, were able to give such an account of themselves against the forces of a great country. Both branches of the people, those of English and those of French origin, contributed to the common defence of their country. Therefore they have a common memory to look back upon.

It is a great tradition in another way, because the triumphs of that war were British Canadian triumphs, and though it occupies a far greater place necessarily in Canadian than in British history, after all the leader in that war, and many of those who contributed to that victory, were Britons from the home land. And it was therefore a good beginning in a way, because it represented a struggle in which Canadian-British and Canadian-French, also British from the home country, stood shoulder to shoulder to face the common enemy. It has been my good fortune to witness a similar combination of forces in another great crisis of the Empire, in which Canada was not immediately interested, but in which Canada came to the aid of the mother country. There were many things in Col. Denison's speech which reminded me of some conditions existing in South Africa and the events of the great struggle there.

But we won't linger on these by-points to-day. I have already dwelt too long upon them, and I call upon you to give a very hearty vote of thanks to the speaker of the day, who has illustrated a great period of your history, done honor to the memory of a great man, and recalled certain lessons of permanent value to British people, whether they live in this country or in any other portion of the Empire.

(October 29th, 1912.)

The Liquor Problem.

BY MR. N. W. ROWELL, K.C., M.P.P.*

AT a special meeting of the Club, held on the 29th of October, 1912, Mr. Rowell said:

Mr. President and Members of the Canadian Club,—I esteem it a great honour and privilege to be asked to speak to the members of the Club on this very important question. I have been asked to discuss it from the standpoint of the proposals we are making to aid in its solution. As I look over this company, I judge that most of you, individually at least, have already abolished the bar!

In all civilized countries, men who are interested in social and industrial problems are devoting their thought and attention to devising the best and most effective methods of dealing with this admittedly difficult subject. So we find in the various states of the United States, in the different provinces of Canada, and in the several countries of Europe, different forms of legislation have been introduced and put into effect, all with the one object, namely, to curtail, if they cannot entirely wipe out, the evils inseparably associated with this traffic. I therefore assume that every man who is interested in the social and industrial betterment of his fellows; every man who is interested in improving the type of citizenship in our country—and I am sure all the members of this Club are—is interested in the problem of the liquor traffic and how best to deal with it legislatively.

In considering the best form of legislation, let me say very frankly that I have no preconceived theory that any one form is necessarily superior to all others. In legislating with reference to the liquor traffic we must have regard to the conditions of the country, the general character of the people, the state of public opinion, and the methods of law enforcement in the country or the province where the law is to be enacted and enforced. What is good for one country, under one set of conditions, may be entirely unsuited to another. The test of the policy must be its efficiency in accomplishing the

* Mr. Newton Wesley Rowell, K.C., is leader of the Liberal party in the Ontario Legislature. He is a fluent and incisive speaker, and his public utterances are generally characterized by much moral earnestness.

purpose aimed at. In framing our policy we have decided upon what we believe to be the best policy for this province, having regard to all these conditions.

In framing a policy we must have regard to the limits of our jurisdiction. The Legislature of Ontario has no power to pass a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors. This comes within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. We have no jurisdiction to prohibit transactions in liquor between residents of this province and the residents of other provinces. We have no power to prohibit the importation by residents of this province of liquor for their own consumption. We have no power to prohibit the manufacture of liquor for export. All these matters are within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. Our policy is not prohibition—we must keep the limits of our jurisdiction clearly in mind in considering the policy—nor is the issue we raise that of total abstinence: that is a matter for each individual to settle for himself. We are dealing with the bar as a social institution, existing in our midst under legislative sanction.

With these preliminary observations, let me now state to you as briefly as I can what our policy is. We stand for the immediate abolition of the bar. By the bar we mean the entire sale of liquor in hotels; we stand for the complete separation of the sale of liquor from the keeping of houses of public entertainment. There are over 1,500 licensed bars in this Province; we propose to wipe them all out. We all recognize that there is a very great difference between the sale of liquor in our high class clubs, and its sale in hotels, yet I am sure we all recognize that there are certain clubs, which, according to report at least, are little better than the hotels. And in dealing with the question of the sale for consumption on the premises, we must adopt the same policy for clubs as for hotels. The sale of liquor for consumption on the premises, both in hotels and clubs, must cease, if our policy goes into effect. But our policy does not stop here. We propose "such other restrictions upon the residue of the liquor traffic as experience may show to be necessary to limit its operations and effective to remedy its evils." It is not reasonable to suppose that by the abolition of the bar we would immediately put an end to the entire sale of liquor that now passes over the bars, in hotels or in clubs. It is only reasonable to expect that there will be an effort to divert a portion of this trade into other channels. Let me say to you frankly, that the present legislation dealing with shop licenses is not.

to my mind, ideal. It can, I believe, be substantially improved. It may be that some radical change is desirable. What we promise is that we will introduce such legislation governing the residue of the traffic as experience may show to be necessary to limit its operations, and effective to remedy its evils. In other words: we have entered upon the difficult task of seeking to solve, as best we can, the problem of how to most effectively curtail, if we cannot entirely wipe out, the evils of the liquor traffic, and we propose to adopt all such legislative methods as experience may show to be necessary to accomplish this desirable end. The third section of our policy is: "The strict enforcement of the law by officials in sympathy with law enforcement, and the elimination of political influence from the administration of the law." This is neither the time nor the place for me to compare the records of the political parties in the province with reference to the administration of the liquor license law, but I wish to say to you that, no matter what may have been the sins or virtues of either party in the past, the time has come in this country when in the public interests, in the interests of sobriety, morality, and purer political life, political interference with the administration of the liquor laws should be completely eliminated. We shall never bring the liquor traffic—for a residue will continue to exist under any legislation this province has power to enact—under the effective control which the public interests demand, unless we entirely remove partisan political influence from the administration of the law, and if the law is to be effectively enforced it must be done by officials in sympathy with law enforcement.

The fourth section of our platform is: "Regulation and inspection of all houses of public entertainment so as to ensure reasonable accommodation for the travelling public." There are those who claim that hotels cannot be carried on successfully without bars. May I remind you that not many years ago the same claim was made with reference to the grocery business? We were told that a grocer could not carry on his business successfully unless he had a license to sell liquor. I remember being told as a boy that a grocer could not make a profit on his business without a liquor license. What is the position to-day? We have completely separated the liquor business from the grocery business. We hear no complaints from the grocers, and no one would for a moment suggest going back to the old state of things. When we put the business of keeping a house of public entertainment for the accommodation of travellers—one of the most important and

honorable occupations there are—on its own basis, where it must depend for its success on its own merits, where the proprietor's sole interest is to cater to the travelling public, we have gone a very long distance to securing proper attention to the needs of the travelling public in every part of the province. Every man knows this would be the result in any other business, and why not in the hotel business? Whatever men may say, I am firmly convinced that the separation of the sale of liquor from the business of hotel keeping will in time greatly improve the character of the hotel accommodation in all parts of the province. But we do not propose to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the hotel keepers. We intend to contribute to the attainment of these results by the regulation and inspection of all hotels.

This, in brief, is the policy which we propose as a measure well adapted to the needs of this province, and one that we believe will greatly promote the public welfare.

When we presented this policy to the House, the Government proposed an alternative policy by way of amendment. I mention this fact, not for the purpose of comparing the two policies, but simply to show that both political parties in this province have, by resolutions, submitted to the House, committed themselves to the position that the existing legislation dealing with the liquor traffic is not satisfactory and is not sufficient, and that new and advanced legislation must be introduced. The Government's proposal is as follows:

This House recognizes the duty cast upon it to minimize as far as possible the evil effects of the drink traffic by wise restrictions upon the traffic in intoxicating liquors; this House also recognizes that, having regard to the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as to the respective jurisdiction of the Dominion and of the provinces, it is impossible for the people of the province through its Legislature to abolish or control the manufacture within or the importation into the province of intoxicating liquors; that the treating habit is now almost universally recognized as the most powerful factor in the evil results of the said traffic, and that no good object would be served by simply diverting the habit from the bar to some other place. That in the opinion of this House legislation to prevent and put a stop to the said treating habit should be enacted and if necessary supplemented by regulations under which retail licenses are granted and sold.

The significance of the situation lies in the fact that both parties are committed to advanced legislation.

Having outlined our policy, may I be permitted to suggest a few reasons why we believe this policy is in the public interests and why we believe public opinion in the province demands advanced legislation of this kind?

I wish to recall to your minds the fact that in recent years the argument against the bar and against the evils of the liquor traffic has been greatly strengthened and reinforced by (a) the teachings of modern science; (b) the demand of modern industry for industrial efficiency; (c) the battle against all forms of social degeneration. Let me deal with these in order.

First: The teachings of modern science. The remarkable change in the attitude of the strongest leaders of the medical profession towards the use of intoxicating liquors, is one of the most significant and hopeful signs of our times. I wish I had time to give you the testimony of such men as Sir Victor Horsley, Sir William Broadbent, Sir Thos. Barlow, and others whose names are almost equally well known. In Germany, where the scientific spirit has possibly found its fullest expression, I am told by a distinguished German who recently visited Toronto, that the Government, conscious of the evil effects of the liquor traffic, has established courses of lectures in main centres of population by the ablest professors in medical science, and requires leading officials of the Government to attend these lectures, in order that they themselves may learn and may in turn communicate to their subordinates the results of the teachings of modern science on the effect of alcohol upon the human system. I am advised that they give the school teachers in Germany a week's vacation to attend these lectures, in order that they may communicate the results to their scholars. I am also informed that in the German Navy, where they desire to secure the highest efficiency, they enforce practically total abstinence. They realize that under modern conditions of naval warfare every man requires his whole energy for all emergencies, and they do not believe he can have this if he indulges in the use of liquor. I also understand that in the German army they have found that during the manœuvres the men who abstain, march further, can do more work with less exhaustion than those who use any kind of alcoholic liquor, and for this reason the Government has forbidden the sale of liquor in the canteens during the army manœuvres. I mention these facts to point out how a country like Germany, seeking primarily the highest

industrial and military efficiency, is adopting these advanced measures in order to educate the people on the evil effects of alcohol.

On the question of industrial efficiency, we all know the stand taken by the Great Railway Corporations on this Continent against their men who occupy positions of responsibility in the operation of the road using liquor in any form. Some few years ago, the Department of Labor of the United States Government, conducted a thorough investigation among the large employers of labor in the United States, in order to ascertain how many of these employers of labor required total abstinence on the part of their employees. In more than one half of the answers received, these employers stated that in positions of responsibility they required total abstinence. And Labor Leaders, like the Rt. Hon. John Burns, Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., Mr. J. Keir Hardie, M.P., and John B. Lennon, Treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, have all pointed out that they are against the saloon and the bar without any qualification because of the evil results upon the working men.

Those interested in the battle against all forms of social degeneration, are realizing more and more every day the important part that the liquor traffic plays in producing social degeneration. It is well that in these modern days we are paying more attention to the social conditions of the men around us. In the past we have devoted much time and thought to the protection of property. To-day, more attention is being paid to the rights of our common humanity, and we are becoming seriously concerned about securing the best conditions for the development of the highest type of citizenship. Some of the ablest students of social conditions have reached the conclusion that probably no single cause is contributing more to social degeneration, crime, poverty, insanity, enfeebled will, and impaired vitality in offspring, than the liquor traffic. They give statistics, as the result of careful investigations, that would startle you, as they have startled me. Time will not permit me to go into them to-day.

This being the general condition, it is no wonder that legislation is being introduced in all progressive countries to curtail the evils of the traffic. If time permitted, it would be very interesting to trace the course of legislation on this question in Great Britain and in Canada. I can only, however, mention a few points. The legislation in Great Britain goes back to a very early date. The Saxons and Danes were very fond of beer—then known as mead—the drinking of which

was supposed to form one of the principal advantages of the heroes admitted to the Hall of Odin, and the manufacture was early introduced into England. The Romans, when they invaded Britain, brought with them their wine drinking habits, and permission to cultivate vines in Britain was granted about A.D. 276. The use of spirits in England dates from about the end of the fourteenth century. The campaigns in the Netherlands in the time of Elizabeth developed the taste for spirituous liquors in the soldiers. The supplies were first drawn from the continent, but later, during the reign of William and Mary and Queen Ann, trade with France was prohibited, and legislation was introduced to encourage distilling in England. Lecky, in his history of England in the 18th century, says:

These measures laid the foundation of the great extension of the English manufacture of spirits, but it was not until 1724 that the passion for gin drinking appears to have infected the masses of the population, and it spread with the rapidity and the violence of an epidemic. Small as is the place which this fact occupies in English history, it was probably, if we consider all the circumstances that have flowed from it, the most momentous in that of the 18th century—incomparably more so than that of any event in the purely political or military annals of the country. The fatal passion for drinking was at once and irrevocably planted in the nation.

One of the earliest pieces of legislation, which I am sure will interest you, was introduced about the 10th century. It was legislation to limit the amount of ale which each man should consume. It sought to get at the evils of the liquor traffic by dealing with the individual. They passed an ordinance that pins or nails should be fastened into the drinking cups or horns at stated distances, so that whoever drank below one of these pegs at one draught, should be liable to severe punishment. I am sure you will see in this a precedent for anti-treating legislation which also claims to limit the amount which each individual shall consume. I am sorry, however, to be compelled to say that history records that this measure was ineffective. Not only so, but as there were several pegs in each pot, it became a source of wagering between the drinkers as to who could drink the largest amount measured by the pegs in the pot.

Various forms of legislation were from time to time passed during the next three or four centuries, but the evils continued

to grow to such proportions that in 1552 an act was passed which formed the beginning of the existing licensing system of Great Britain. This and other acts were from time to time amended until the Act of 1880 laid the foundation of the modern licensing system in Great Britain.

It is only right to say, in reviewing the history of British legislation on this matter, that where legislation was enacted substantially in advance of public opinion, it proved ineffective, and was either repealed or modified, and we should from this learn the lesson that however much we may desire to curtail and limit the traffic, where government is by the people, springs from the people and is not imposed on the people by some superior authority from above, we cannot go far in advance of public sentiment. We may advocate a policy in advance of public sentiment with a view to educating public opinion up to the point of supporting such a policy, but when we come to legislation you cannot with advantage to the community go far in advance of public sentiment. But side by side with this is another fact, equally worthy of consideration, and that is whenever public sentiment has advanced beyond the point of existing legislation and demands more advanced legislation, that public opinion is greatly reinforced and the public interests are materially advanced by the enactment of advanced legislation. Nothing will ever take the place of education—the informing of the public mind and conscience on these matters, and the development of an intelligent conviction—but we hold that it is the duty of the Legislator, once public opinion has advanced to the point where it will support more progressive legislation, to give effect to that public sentiment by the enactment of the necessary legislation.

Dealing with the question of legislation in our own province, I will just mention one or two facts. In 1875 there were 6,185 liquor licenses in this province. In 1877 the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat passed the Crooks Act, which cut off 2,247. They cut off more licenses by that act than our policy would do if put into force to-morrow. This act has been from time to time amended, down to the year, I think, of 1899, so as to increase the unit of population necessary to secure a license, and just as the unit has increased, it has necessitated a reduction in the number of licenses.

In 1890, the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat passed the local option law. Under this law municipalities may vote out both the bars and the shops. This act has been from time to time amended and improved, so that now it is a very effective instrument in the hands of any local municipality where public

sentiment is strong enough to carry local option with the vote now required under that act. The result of the local option campaigns in recent years, carried on under the direction of the temperance forces of this province, has been to greatly reduce the number of liquor licenses, so that to-day there are only 1,836 liquor licenses in this province. While we should congratulate ourselves on the great progress thus made, we must bear in mind that local option has so far scarcely affected our cities and larger centres of population. The bars still flourish in these centres. Take the City of Toronto at the present time. If anyone wishes to know just what the bar is and what it is doing, let him visit some of these bars in the afternoon or evening, and particularly on a Saturday afternoon. Don't take my word for it, but see for yourselves. I am sure you will agree that its influence is, and can only be, demoralizing to the worst degree. By the best estimate I am able to obtain, there must be paid over the bars of the City of Toronto annually probably not less than \$5,000,000, certainly considerably more than \$4,000,000. What would it mean to all the legitimate industries and business enterprises of the city if this money, instead of going over the bar went to the purchase of other commodities for the home and for the family?

I believe that public opinion has reached the point in this province where, if it can freely and fairly express itself, it will declare for the abolition of the bar. Whenever the people of this province have had an opportunity of expressing themselves by vote, they have expressed themselves overwhelmingly against the liquor traffic. Take the Dominion Plebiscite of 1898:

The vote in Ontario for prohibitory law was..	154,498
Against	115,284

Majority for	39,214
--------------------	--------

Take the vote on the approval of the Liquor Act of 1902, which was a measure of Provincial prohibition:

The vote in favor was	199,749
Against	103,548

Majority for	96,201
--------------------	--------

The votes in local municipalities of the province where local option by-laws have been submitted show a very great preponderance of sentiment among the electors of the province in favor of the abolition of the bar. The men and women who have been battling for temperance reform in this

province for over half a century, and have been very influential in producing the great improvement in the conditions in our province in which we all rejoice to-day, are firmly convinced, and have so expressed themselves by resolution and by action, that the abolition of the bar is the present urgent need of temperance reform in this province.

You ask, why not include shops in your proposal? If you are going to abolish the bar, why not abolish the shops as well? I can answer that in one word. We must recognize that we cannot prohibit the importation of liquor into this province by individuals for their own consumption. There are those who believe that as liquor can come in for domestic consumption, and will no doubt in some measure come in, it is better that it should come in under regulation by sale in shops in sealed packages, where the sale can be regulated and controlled, than that it should be left to unregulated and uncontrolled importation. There is also a strong body of public opinion entirely opposed to the bar, which believes the bar as it exists to-day is a curse to society, but which believes that men should have the right to have liquor in their own homes if they so desire. I am not here to discuss whether this view is correct or not, but any public man seeking to legislate for the whole people must recognize the conditions of public opinion, and must propose measures which public opinion will support. To those men who believe in prohibition and to those men who believe only in the abolition of the bar, what I have to say is this: Let us go together as far as we can all agree, let us go together and wipe out the bar; when we have done this we can discuss further legislative measures. We must not forget that the local option law still continues in force and wherever public sentiment in any local municipality is in favor of wiping out the shop also, this can be done under local option by-law, and wherever the shop is not wiped out under local option by-laws, we propose, as I have already explained, such legislation as may be necessary to limit its operations and effective to remedy its evils.

May I ask you in conclusion to give to this whole problem your most serious thought. It is one of the most important questions with which legislators in this and every other British community have to deal. It is not easy of solution. The public men who try to solve it, no matter what the remedy proposed, do not rest on beds of roses. Are not all men who are studying the problem seeking to find the solution—whether we agree with their conclusions or not—deserving of the sympathetic encouragement and support of those interested

in the betterment of the social and industrial conditions of our province to-day?

To-day, you test the bar as it now exists; by the test you apply to any other social institution, for it exists as a social institution, and we are dealing with it as such: can any man name any one good purpose that the bars serve? The bars on Queen Street, on Yonge Street, on other streets, do they serve any good purpose? We all know many evil purposes which the bars serve. Is it not true that the children of many of those men who patronize these bars, have not as good a chance for life and to make of themselves good citizens, as they would have if their fathers did not spend their money over the bar? And, after all, the home is the basis of our civilization. Anything you can do, or I can do, to improve the condition of the home, is a matter which every man should be glad to do, for he is contributing to the future welfare of his country and his race. How many young men in Toronto would be better if the bars were closed? You know and I know what an unspeakable blessing it would be to thousands of our young men if there were no open bars. To-day we are seeking to bring immigrants to our country in order to people our unoccupied spaces; they are coming from all lands; we are putting forth great efforts to educate them; we are bringing upon ourselves a most difficult problem, the problem of assimilating them. Should not every patriotic citizen seek to preserve at his best every Canadian boy who lives here? Shall we do this best by keeping open, or by closing the bars?

Whether you agree with the policies I have outlined or not, I am sure you all agree in this: It is our duty to devote our best efforts to the suppression of the evils of the liquor traffic, to do our best to preserve the Canadian home and the Canadian boy, to seek to improve the type of citizenship in this province; and you will give your sympathy and encouragement to all who labor with these ends in view.

(November 4th, 1912.)

Panama Canal and Treaty Obligations.

BY SIR GEORGE W. ROSS.*

ADDRESSING a regular meeting of the Canadian Club on Nov. 4th, 1912, Sir George W. Ross said:—

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—As an epitome of the course I propose taking in discussing the Panama canal, let me say I shall first consider its advantages to the commerce of Europe, America, and the eastern coast of Asia, by shortening the distance between the various sea ports on the different coasts of these continents, but more especially the advantages to Canada by putting her at an easy distance between her Atlantic and her Pacific coast and the west coast of South America, with which there is a growing trade; second, I shall consider the various treaties between Great Britain and the United States and the other countries in which the terms on which the canal was to be used by all nations, are specifically set forth; third, the attitude of the United States Senate both with regard to the tolls charged to the foreign and coastwise trade of merchant vessels using the canal; fourth, the disadvantage to Canada in the final decision of the Senate by which the coastwise traffic of the United States is permitted to use the canal free of tolls, while the coastwise trade of Canada is subject to the same tolls as the shipping of foreign nations, and, lastly, the attitude which we should assume in endeavoring to secure justice for our shipping under the solemn treaty agreed to both by the United States and Great Britain.

For many years before Columbus set sail towards the west in the hope of discovering a short route to India, it was the opinion of European geographers that such a route existed, and although Columbus failed in his quest, France and Great Britain were incited by his example to send expeditions from time to time for the same purpose. To Spain, however, belongs the honor of extending her explorations as far west

* Sir George William Ross, Kt., LL.D., of Scottish extraction, was born 72 years ago in Middlesex County, Ontario, was for some years a school teacher and inspector, was called to the bar in 1887, entered the Dominion Parliament in 1872, became Minister of Education in 1883, and was Premier and Provincial Treasurer from 1899 to 1905. He was called to the Senate in 1907, was lately elected Liberal leader in the Upper Chamber, and is one of the two or three most effective public speakers in the Dominion.

as the Isthmus of Darien, and Balboa, a Spanish explorer, was the first European to cross the isthmus and look upon the still waters of the Pacific ocean. This was in 1513. In 1521 the Spanish government made a survey of the isthmus to ascertain if a canal connecting the two oceans was feasible. Here this great project rested without further action for three centuries. In 1804 Humboldt, the great traveller, explored four different routes for a canal and made known to the world his opinion regarding its commercial advantages.

As time went on the growing commerce of the United States between its Atlantic and Pacific coast, as well as the enormous development of commerce between Europe and Japan, China, Mexico and the republics of the west coast of South America, accentuated the desirability of the short route by way of Panama instead of the long and perilous route by way of Magellan straits. The advantage to navigation in thus shortening the distance between some of the larger sea ports of the world from the east to the west is very striking. For instance, taking Liverpool as representing the most important port in Europe, the distance from Liverpool to Vancouver would be shortened by 5,666 miles, and from other European ports, such as Antwerp and Havre, more or less to a similar extent.

Turning to this side of the Atlantic I find, on the authority of Mr. Johnson, Commissioner of the United States on the Panama canal, that the distance between New York and San Francisco would be shortened by 7,873 miles, to the west coast of South America 5,139 miles, and to Yokohama 3,768 miles, with a proportionate advantage to New Orleans and the other American ports on the south. From New York to Sydney, Australia, there would be a saving of 3,669 miles, to Melbourne 2,770 and to Wellington, New Zealand, 2,493 miles. Similar advantages in distance would accrue to the commerce of the republics on the east and west coast of South America.

If we simply consider the construction of the Panama canal as it is likely to affect Canadian commerce, the following advantages would accrue:

1. Vancouver is brought 7,271 miles nearer to Montreal than it is by the Straits of Magellan. Car loads of merchandise across the continent cost \$30 per ton and upwards. By way of the Panama canal the cost is estimated at from \$6 to \$9 per ton, with delivery in 30 days instead of 90 days around the Horn. The trade between British Columbia and the maritime provinces last year amounted to 118,417 tons, including vessels entered and cleared. With a shorter route by way of

the Panama canal and the substantial reduction in freights as compared with the transcontinental railways, this trade would no doubt increase rapidly.

2. The distance between Vancouver and Liverpool would be reduced by 5,666 miles. The effect of this would no doubt be largely to increase the imports and exports of British Columbia to and from Europe. In fish alone the output of British Columbia in 1910 amounted to \$9,000,000, a large portion of which already goes to European markets. British Columbia has also a large output of timber, the value of which will be greatly enhanced by cheaper transportation.

3. The Panama canal would afford to Canadian shipping easier access to the republics of South America on the Pacific coast and to Mexico and California, with all of which a large trade could be developed in the exchange of Canadian manufactures for the tropical and subtropical products of these countries.

4. As the West India Islands, most probably Jamaica, would become a coaling station for vessels en route to the west, an additional market would be supplied for the coal mines of Nova Scotia, for which return cargoes to Canada would be readily obtained in the abundant produce of these islands.

A very important advantage to Canada not to be omitted would be the advantage of the Panama route in relieving the railway transportation of the enormous wheat products of the western provinces. So rapid has been the production of wheat, and so brief the period for transportation to the Canadian ports on Lake Superior, that it is doubtful whether even with three transcontinental railways this congestion can be fully relieved at all times. Should the western wheat fields produce, as it is expected, four or five hundred million bushels, within the next five or ten years, the loss to the farmers by delay in being relieved of their grain, would be even greater than it is at present. An outlet, therefore, by way of Vancouver to Liverpool via the Panama canal is of the greatest importance, and I believe not impracticable. For instance, Calgary is 616 miles nearer Vancouver than it is to Fort William, the nearest shipping point on the east. Fort William is closed to navigation within two or three months of the harvesting of the western wheat, while Vancouver is open all the year round. If the route from Edmonton to Vancouver is adopted, the saving in distance would be 716 miles as against Fort William. At the close of navigation of the upper lakes the nearest sea port to the west is St. John, a distance of

2,393 miles from Moose Jaw, about the centre of the western wheat fields. If shipped west by way of Vancouver, the distance would be only 1,085 miles. Even if the freight rates by way of Liverpool were not less than the route by which western grain now reaches European markets, and it is confidently expected they would be, the relief from congestion, which is likely to prevail, would, in itself, greatly benefit the farmers of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

In an interview at Ottawa, Sir Richard McBride, Premier of British Columbia, said:

The persistently reiterated statements that the movement of Canadian export wheat via Vancouver and the Panama canal will not be practicable are unworthy of notice. I can say officially that it is within my knowledge that elevator men of the largest responsibility are planning for the construction of vast grain elevators on the Pacific coast to take care of the expected grain export trade which the completion of the Panama canal will bring over our way.

In view of these advantages to commerce, it becomes the settled policy of the two nations more immediately concerned in the construction of the Panama canal, viz., the United States and Great Britain, that the territory through which the canal passed should be neutralized and that, no matter what country possessed the sovereignty of the soil, so far as the canal was concerned, "all nations" should be permitted to use it on terms of "equality." The first nation to make a declaration, so far as I can ascertain, to that effect, was the United States. In 1826 a Congress of the Independent States of Central America was held at Panama for the purpose of considering the construction of the canal between the two oceans. At this congress the United States was represented by invitation, but owing to the unsettled condition of Central American politics, nothing definite was accomplished. As indicating the attitude of the United States towards this project, it is interesting to quote from the instructions given by Henry Clay to the United States delegates:

"If the work should ever be concluded," he said, "the benefits should not be exclusively appropriated to one nation, but should be extended to all ports of the globe upon payment of just compensation and reasonable tolls."

The convention at Panama having failed, the United States Senate took up the question, and on March 2, 1835, adopted unanimously the following resolution:

Resolved, that the President of the United States be respectfully asked to consider the expediency of opening negotiations with the Governments of other nations, and particularly with the Government of Central America and New Granada, for the purpose of effectually protecting, by suitable treaty stipulations with them, such individuals or companies as may undertake to open a communication between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by the construction of a ship canal across the Isthmus which connects North and South America, and of securing forever, by such stipulations, the free and equal right of navigating such canal to all such nations, on the payment of such reasonable tolls as may be established to compensate the capitalists who may engage in such undertaking and complete the work.

Four years later, in 1839, the House of Representatives, by unanimous vote, adopted a resolution requesting the President:

To consider the expediency of opening or continuing negotiations with the Governments of other nations, and particularly with those the territorial jurisdiction of which comprehends the Isthmus of Panama, and to which the United States have accredited ministers or agents, for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability of effecting a communication between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by the construction of a ship canal across the Isthmus and of securing forever, by suitable treaty stipulations, the free and equal right of navigating such canal by all nations.

In the treaty between the United States and New Granada, ratified on the 12th day of December, 1846, Article 35, it was agreed that New Granada and the United States should have similar privileges as to the transit of passengers and merchandise over any canal that might be completed under the treaty. In commenting on this treaty President Polk said:

The ultimate object, as presented by the Senate of the United States in their resolution to which I have already referred, is to secure to all nations the free and equal rights of passage over the Isthmus.

Mr. Clayton, Ambassador to London, in a letter to the Secretary of State, September 25, 1849, stated:

That the United States sought no exclusive privilege or preferential right of any kind in regard to the proposed communication, and their sincere wish, if it should be found practicable, was to see it dedicated to

the common use of all nations on the most liberal terms and a footing of perfect equality for all.

Again he says:

That the United States would not, if they could, obtain any exclusive right of privilege in the highway which naturally belongs to all mankind, that while they aimed at no exclusive privilege for themselves, they could never consent to see so important a communication fall under the exclusive control of any other commercial power.

In 1850 the famous Clayton-Bulwer treaty, for the construction of a canal, was made between Great Britain and the United States. It provided that neither the United States nor Great Britain should exclusively control the canal or build any fortifications along it; that they should guard the safety and neutrality of the canal and invite all other nations to do the same, that they should give aid and support to any satisfactory company which would construct the canal.

(Art. 1) That neither Great Britain nor the United States would grant the citizens or subjects of the one, any rights or advantages as regards commerce or navigation to the said canal, which shall not be offered on the same terms to the citizens or subjects of the other.

Mr. Secretary Fish, during the administration of President Grant, wrote:

We shall.....be glad of any movement which shall result in the early decision of the question of the most practicable route and the early commencement and speedy conclusion of an interoceanic communication which shall be guaranteed in its perpetual neutralization and dedication to the commerce of all nations, without advantage to one over another of those who guarantee its assured neutrality.

Secretary of State Blaine, in his instructions to Mr. Lowell, said:

Nor does the United States seek any exclusive or narrow commercial advantage. It frankly agrees and will by public proclamation declare at the proper time in conjunction with the Republic on whose soil the canal may be located that the same rights and privileges, the same tolls and obligations for the use of the canal shall apply with absolute impartiality to the merchant marine of every nation on the globe; and equally in time of peace the harmless use of the canal shall be freely granted to the war vessels of other nations.

President Cleveland, in his message of 1885, his first message to Congress, said:

These suggestions may serve to emphasize what I have already said on the score of the necessity of the neutralization of any interoceanic transit; and this can only be accomplished by making the uses of the route open to all nations and subject to the ambitions and warlike necessities of none.

From Secretary of State Olney's memorandum, 1896:

That the interoceanic routes there specified should, under the sovereignty of the States traversed by them, be neutral and free to all nations alike.

On December 13, 1888, the De Lesseps Company, that undertook to construct the canal, suspended payment and went into bankruptcy. He estimated the cost of the canal at \$114,000,000, and promised to finish it for \$120,000,000. At the end of 1888 not more than one-fifth of the work was done, while nearly \$400,000,000 had been paid out of the treasury. It was said that one-third of this money had been spent on the canal, one-third wasted, and one-third stolen.

In 1890 a new company was organized to complete the canal under M. Grenade, the time for completion being extended to October 1, 1904. He estimated that the canal would be completed for \$100,000,000.

In the meantime steps were taken for the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty by which the United States bound itself not to build a canal across Panama and the result of which was the first Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1900. This treaty was amended by the United States Senate, but in its amended form it was rejected by the British government.

The second treaty known as the Hay-Pauncefote treaty 1901, was ratified by the United States Senate. It superseded the Clayton-Bulwer treaty (1850) and gave the United States the privilege to construct, operate, and control the canal without any co-operation or guarantee from Great Britain or any other country.

President Roosevelt, in submitting the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to Congress, said:

It specifically provides that the United States alone should do the work of building and assume the responsibility of safeguarding the canal and shall regulate its neutral use by all nations on terms of equality without the guarantee or interference of any outside nation from any quarter.

Again he says, on January 4, 1904, in the special message:

Under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, it was explicitly provided that the United States should control, police and protect the canal which was to be built, keeping it open for the vessels of all nations on equal terms. The United States thus assumes the position of guarantor of the canal and of its peaceful use by all the world.

In a note by Secretary Hay, on January 5, 1904, he states:

The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was conceived to form an obstacle, and the British Government therefore agreed to abrogate it, the United States only promising in return to protect the canal and keep it open on equal terms to all nations, in accordance with our traditional policy.

Senator Davis, in his report to the President of the United States on the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, said:

No American statesman speaking with official authority or responsibility has ever intimated that the United States would attempt to control this canal for the exclusive benefit of our Government or people. They have all with one accord declared that the canal was to be neutral ground in time of war, and always open on terms of impartial equality.

To set up a selfish motive of gain by establishing a monopoly of a highway that must derive its income from the patronage of all maritime countries, would be unworthy of the United States if we owned the country through which the canal was to be built.

I have dwelt upon the treaties between Great Britain and the United States at some length because they seem to occupy the forefront of the situation so far as any decisive action was concerned. It must not be forgotten, however, that other nations of Europe appeared to be equally anxious for the early construction of the canal and treaties for this purpose were made with Spain in 1850, with Belgium in 1858, with France in 1859, and with Italy in 1871. In addition to these treaties, concessions were made to private corporations, and Congress at different times voted large sums of money for the survey of several routes, for the purpose of ascertaining their relative feasibility and cost. The route most favored by the last Board of Commissioners appointed by the United States government for this purpose was by way of Lake Nicaragua, which, although a longer route than by way of Panama, promised to be less expensive. Not content, however, with the result of the examination by way of Nicaragua, a treaty was entered

into with New Granada, now known as Columbia, for a concession across Panama. This treaty was submitted to the Senate of New Granada, but failed in ratification. In the meantime the new French Panama Company was pursuing its labors under financial difficulties. It was bound by its concession from Columbia to complete the canal in 1904, a contract which seemed impossible of fulfilment, and when a further extension of time was asked, Columbia seemed disinclined to grant such a privilege, and that brings me back to the failure of Columbia to ratify the treaty made with the United States. The province of Panama, which formed part of Columbia, was most anxious for the completion of the canal, and on the failure of Columbia to ratify the treaty, arose in rebellion against the parent state. The rebellion broke out on November 3, 1903, and on the 10th of November, Panama was recognized as a separate republic by the United States.

On November 18 a treaty was formed between the United States and the new republic for the concession of a strip of land ten miles wide extending across the isthmus a distance of 41 miles, to be known as the canal zone. For this concession the United States paid \$10,000,000 in cash, and agreed to pay an annual rental of \$250,000, beginning nine years after the date of the treaty, and to be paid from year to year so long as the treaty remained in force. The French Panama Company, burdened by its financial difficulties, became discouraged, and agreed with the United States to sell its concession and all its plant, works and buildings for the sum of \$40,000,000. By these two transactions, viz., its treaty with Panama and its purchase of the French company's interests, the United States was in a position to take up this great project and to throw into it the characteristic force of the American nation in dealing with public undertakings. Accordingly, under the direct control of the government of the United States, work was begun in 1904, and from recent reports the canal is to be completed in 1915, at a maximum cost of \$400,000,000. In its treaty with Panama the United States agreed that the conditions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty should apply to the canal. By Article 18, of the Panama treaty, it was agreed:

The canal when constructed, and the entrances thereto, shall be neutral in perpetuity, and shall be opened upon the terms provided for by Section 1 of Article III of and in conformity with all the stipulations of this treaty (the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty entered into by the Government, of the United States and Great Britain on November 18, 1901.)

Having now brought down the record of the treaties entered into for the construction of the canal, we are brought face to face with the action of Congress at its last session and to the consideration of that action so far as it affects Canada. By message from the President of the United States, Congress was asked to legislate for the maintenance and government of the canal, and also as to the proper charges to be made for its use. The discussion of this message took place principally in the Senate and naturally divided itself into two parts. (1) The tolls to be charged on the foreign shipping of all nations using the canal, and (2) the tolls to be charged on the coastwise vessels, i.e., of vessels trading from port to port of the coast of any nation using the canal. In regard to coastwise traffic, the United States, the republics on opposite coasts of South America and Canada were the only nations interested.

In order that we might understand clearly the condition imposed upon the United States government if it undertook the construction of the canal, let me quote from the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901. By Article 3 of the treaty it was agreed between Great Britain and the United States that:

The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality, so that there should be no discrimination against any such nation or its citizens or subjects in respect to the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

Unless we adopt the aphorism of Talleyrand, that the use of language is to conceal our thoughts, Article 3, which I have just read, can only have one meaning, i.e., that "all nations" have the right to use the canal on terms of "entire equality." Notwithstanding the unmistakable fairness of the conditions prescribed in this article, the President of the United States, in his message to Congress, said:

. . . I am confident that the United States has the power to relieve from the payment of tolls any part of our shipping that Congress deems wise. We own the canal, it was our money that built it. We have the right to charge tolls for its use. These tolls must be the same to everyone, but when we are dealing with our own ships, the practice of many Governments of subsidizing their own marine vessels is so well established in general, that a subsidy equal to the tolls as equivalent remission of tolls cannot be held to

be a discrimination in the use of the canal. The practice in the Suez Canal makes this clear.

Speaking in the Senate to the Bill introduced on the advice of the President, Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, said:

When I reported the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty my own impression was that it left the United States in complete control of the tolls upon its own vessels. I did not suppose then that there was any limitation upon our right to charge such tolls as we pleased upon our own vessels or that we were included in the term "all nations." The payment of tolls is a domestic question for us and for nobody else to settle. If we saw fit by paying the tolls to give American vessels the benefit of the canal which we have built and paid for, we have a clear right to do it, and we violate no treaty injunction by doing it . . . nobody can go beyond that and ask where the money came from . . . the power to fix the tolls does not give us the power to go behind and inquire who is paying the tolls.

The British Government paid to the P. and O. Steamship line for carrying mails, £297,142,000, as against the sum of £357,000,000 paid in tolls.

In confirmation of his contention that the American government had the right to subsidize its shipping, either foreign or coastwise, to the extent of the tolls charged for the use of the canal, Senator Lodge gave several illustrations of the practice prevailing in the case of the Suez canal. For instance:

The North German Lloyd Steamers received an annual subsidy of \$1,395,160 for carrying mails to Asia and Australia. These were admittedly indirect subsidies. There were other subsidies, however, that were specially made in lieu of tolls. Russia in 1909 paid \$934,750; Japan, \$1,336,947; France, \$2,145,232; Austria, Krs. 4,700,000 and Spain, \$285,000.

Notwithstanding these precedents, Senator McComber, of North Dakota, uttered a warning note as follows:

We may provide for carrying coastwise or foreign mails over such routes as our judgment may direct, and we may give a subsidy for carrying our mails, but we may not, by any kind of under-hand means, or indirectly, violate an agreement to charge our coastwise, or any other, vessel the same tolls as we charge the vessels of Canada engaged in the coastwise trade, or the vessels of any other country engaged in any trade.

If we off-set tolls by a subsidy, it must be based upon such conditions as would justify the subsidy, irrespective of tolls, otherwise it might not be a good faith transaction. Every diplomatic utterance for over half a century stands for a warrant of our good faith. Every message of our President who has discussed the subject of our Isthmian canal during that period is a national declaration of our policy to maintain as a great world canal, such connecting highway between the oceans dedicated to peace, and within whose zone the clamor of war should never be heard.

Mr. Cummings, of Iowa, disregarding the argument of a subsidy, took the ground that American shipping should be free of tolls because of the sovereignty of the United States over the canal zone. He said:

My proposition is that the Government of the United States undertook the enterprise, and the rules that would have been applicable if it had been carried forward by private enterprise, are not applicable or appropriate because there are certain qualities in sovereignty that ought not to be surrendered and only the clearest terms would warrant the construction that surrenders it.

But I must not trouble the House with further quotations from the many able speeches on the subject. The conclusion arrived at finally was that embodied in the Bill, afterwards signed by the President, that the foreign shipping of the United States should pay \$1.25 on the registered tonnage of American shipping using the canal and \$1.50 on every passenger. The reasons which led to this conclusion would appear to be:

1. That, strictly construed, the term, "all nations" in the treaty, did include the United States.

2. That good faith must be kept with the precise terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, or to use the words of Senator Lodge:

I do not wish anything done by this Government that could ever be exposed to the suggestion, even, of not acting in good faith under the treaty. I think we should be most punctilious even if there is nothing more than a doubt about the word in carrying out the Treaty strictly to its letter.

3. That the foreign shipping of the United States was comparatively small (it having been stated that it did not exceed ten vessels in all) and that to construe the treaty as excluding

American shipping, was raising an issue of comparatively little importance.

4. That to construe the treaty in a manner that might be objectionable to Great Britain, who was a party to it, might involve an appeal to the Hague tribunal, and that such an appeal, if made, would, in all probability, be adverse to the United States. On this point Senator Lodge said:

If we should undertake simply to make our ships free, we should then raise a question which would under our treaties of arbitration, necessarily go to the Hague, and if it goes to the Hague I think we may take it as decided now. It is not likely that the United States would ever get a favorable decision from that tribunal on a question when the interests of Europe are on one side and of the United States on the other.

With this final decision that the vessels engaged in foreign trade should be placed on a basis of entire equality as to tolls, Canada has no objection to offer. If our vessels trade with the republics on the west coast of South America, or with Mexico or California, they ought to pay the same tolls as vessels from Europe or elsewhere similarly engaged. We are quite willing that the United States should receive ample compensation for the vast investment it is making in the construction of the Panama canal. We recognize it as an enterprise beyond the resources of any private corporation and that the United States has placed the whole world under an obligation for undertaking a work of such tremendous importance to the commerce of two continents in which we are included, and we now look to its early completion and the development of our trade with our own province of British Columbia on the west and with South America and Mexico as a consequence.

The Senate having decided that vessels engaged in the foreign trade of the United States should pay the same tolls as other nations, gave its attention to the charges which should be made, (if any) on coastwise traffic, and, strange to say, came to the conclusion as contained in section 5 of the Bill to which I have referred—"that no tolls shall be levied on vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States," thus placing Canadian vessels engaged in the coasting trade of Canada on the same basis as vessels engaged in the foreign trade. That such a decision is inconsistent with the conclusion reached with regard to vessels engaged in foreign trade is quite manifest from the speeches made by leading senators during the debate. To quote again from Senator Lodge:

I cannot draw any distinction between American vessels engaged in the coastwise trade and those in foreign commerce. They all alike, it seems to me, come under the first clause in article 3. A doubtful question is whether in making that treaty when the United States said "all nations" the United States intended to include itself. That is the whole question. Some of us believe that it did not, and some that it did.... For the purposes of this treaty it does not make any difference what trade they are engaged in.... In my opinion.... there is no distinction to be drawn between American vessels engaged in coastwise traffic and American vessels engaged in the foreign trade. There is no such distinction in the treaty. It says the vessels of "all nations."

In the face of this declaration of Senator Lodge, that foreign and coastwise traffic were on precisely the same basis so far as the treaty was concerned, to charge foreign vessels with a toll, and to relieve coastwise traffic of any charge whatsoever, appears as a glaring inconsistency for which no explanation has yet been offered.

Following up the speeches of senators still further, not only does it appear an inconsistency, but a discrimination against Canada which calls for the most emphatic protest.

To quote Senator Lodge again:

This whole excitement has arisen out of the fact that there is one country and only one country in the world which is situated with regard to the canal just as we are..... and that is Canada. England is not worrying over her own merchant marine.... The trouble is the Canadian voyage. If our ships have an advantage, the Canadian business would probably come in American vessels to American ports and then by American railways back to Canada. The discrimination in competition with Canada seems very clear to me and very direct. I think they feel it very much in Canada. It is well worth while to remember that there is a Canadian Atlantic coast and a Canadian Pacific coast; the commerce between the Atlantic and the Pacific is largely a competing one. Under this provision ships from the United States would be free from tolls and those from Canada would be subject to the payment of tolls. Thereby the American coasting trade is at once given, by being free of tolls, an advantage as against the Canadian trade. That is at the bottom of all this trouble.

Speaking to the same effect, Senator McComber, of North Dakota, said:

We are, by disregarding this treaty and allowing our coastwise vessels to go free through the canal, giving a preferential right to our coastwise trade, not only as against the coastwise trade of any other country, but also as against the foreign competing vessels entering our ports.

The arguments advanced in favor of free use of the canal for United States shipping engaged in the coasting trade may be summed up as follows:

1. That as the coastwise traffic was a purely domestic traffic in which foreign vessels could not engage, the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty could not apply to it.

2. That as there could be no competition with American vessels in the coastwise traffic by virtue of this prohibition, there could be no discrimination in their favor. A preference for American shipping could only apply where it was placed in competition with foreign shipping.

3. That the Panama canal being owned by the United States was merely an extension of the coast line of the United States and therefore came under coastwise traffic.

4. That to impose a toll upon domestic commerce would be a tax upon United States shipping and detrimental to a very important branch of domestic commerce.

5. That as it was desirable to establish competition between transcontinental railways carrying freight from east to west and vice versa it was necessary that the shipping engaged in a similar trade should be relieved from all charges that would be likely to increase the cost of freight and shipping between the two coasts.

Let me briefly consider these arguments in detail. Was it intended by the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty that the coastwise traffic of the United States should be treated the same as traffic of "all nations?" Senator Lodge claimed that there was no distinction between coastwise and foreign traffic. Then, if there was no distinction, there should be no discrimination, for the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty clearly states that vessels of "all nations" should be considered on terms of "entire equality." And here it is important to notice that, when the first Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was before the Senate in 1900, it was moved by Senator Bard, of California, that

The United States reserves the right, in the management and regulation of the canal, to discriminate in respect to charges of traffic of vessels of its own citizens engaged in the coastwise trade.

This amendment was rejected on the ground that it was unnecessary, inasmuch as foreign vessels could not engage in coasting trade according to the coasting laws of the United States. But, is that what the amendment means? It says "the United States reserves the right to discriminate in respect to vessels of its own citizens engaged in the coastwise trade." By the rejection of the amendment, that right was not reserved and, if not reserved, it must have remained subject to the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, and, if so, it is beyond the power of Congress to remove it from the treaty, as, by the constitution of the United States, the terms of the treaty are not subject to amendment by legislation.

But this amendment has another aspect. It was admitted to the floor of the Senate that, if it had been adopted and incorporated into the second treaty, the British Government would have rejected the treaty on that account. Are we justified, therefore, in assuming that its exclusion was intentional in order that Congress, when it came to legislate in the matter of tolls, would not, unless by the direct terms of the treaty, be restrained from taking the course finally decided upon? If it was the intention of the United States Senate to exclude coastwise traffic from the treaty, the time to say so was when the treaty was being negotiated and not ten years later.

Again, if the Senate was justified, under the treaty, in relieving the coastwise traffic of the United States from tolls, would it not necessarily follow that a similar privilege should be extended to the coastwise traffic of Canada? Both countries are in precisely the same position, as was admitted in the Senate, in regard to traffic between their eastern and western coasts. The treaty says that the vessels of "all nations" were to be permitted the use of the canal on terms of "entire equality and without discrimination." If the treaty allows the coastwise traffic of the United States to be free, it certainly should allow a similar privilege to Canadian coastwise traffic, and that right should be insisted upon by the Government of Canada in the strongest terms.

Nor does the fact that American coastwise traffic is absolutely free from competition strengthen the argument in favor of relieving American coasting vessels from tolls in the canal. Canadian coasting traffic is precisely in a similar position and it should be treated with equal consideration.

The claim that, as the United States owned the canal, and, by virtue of that ownership or sovereignty, as urged by Mr. Cummins, of Iowa, the canal became part of the coastline of

the United States, does not, in my opinion, place the canal in the same relation to the coasting trade as its ordinary natural boundaries. In the first place, the canal is purely an artificial boundary. The sovereignty over it is not absolute as is the sovereignty of the United States over its Atlantic and Pacific coast line. At best, it is but a conditional sovereignty subject to a treaty with Great Britain. The natural boundaries of the United States are subject to no treaty and, therefore, its control in that respect is absolute. With respect to the canal the United States Government bound itself in solemn treaty that "the canal should be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations. . . . on terms of entire equality." This, if it means anything at all, means a division of sovereignty between Great Britain and the United States. The United States is, by the treaty, the trustees for all nations observing the rules under which the canal is governed. While the United States Government has power to regulate tolls and provide for the maintenance and protection of the canal, it does so, not for itself alone, that is to say, by the law of sovereignty, but as a trustee for the commerce of the world. Supposing the canal had been constructed by the Republic of New Granada, or Nicaragua, under treaty with the United States or Great Britain on the terms indicated in the earlier part of my speech, would the United States acknowledge any ground of sovereignty to discriminate between the coasting and foreign trade of the United States? I mistake very much the temper of Congress if any such ground would be admitted. The United States, therefore, being the trustee of the Panama Canal under conditional sovereignty only, have we not a right to insist that this trusteeship shall be exercised according to the conditions under which it was assumed, namely, "that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect to the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise."

It was also objected in the Senate that a toll upon the domestic commerce of the United States would be detrimental to the development of United States shipping, and more particularly to the shipbuilding industry of the New England States. Admitting this to be true, would not a similar argument apply to Canadian shipping? When Great Britain entered into the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, we may reasonably assume that she did so in the expectation that it would not, in any manner, prove detrimental to her subjects in her dominions beyond the seas. Shipbuilding is a very important industry on the Atlantic coast, and will, no doubt, grow in

importance on the Pacific coast as well. Having protected their own shipping by rigid coasting laws, it is now proposed to encourage that shipping by free tolls regardless of the fact that, by discriminating against the Canadian coasting trade, they are acting adversely to the shipping interests of Canada. That, in my opinion, is also a discrimination against Canadian interests.

A great deal of importance was attached to the remission of the tolls of the coast trade of the United States from the fact that it would strengthen the competition between transportation over land by rail and transportation via the canal by water. It was alleged that, although there are several transcontinental railways in the United States, there was really no competition between them, as their schedules for freight were practically the same. Though not avowedly a combination for mutual protection, the shipper of merchandise across the continent was at their mercy, and the only relief possible, under the circumstances, was competition by water. This was a condition which Congress has endeavored to relieve by a remission of the tolls on coastwise traffic through the canal. The position of Canada in regard to its transcontinental railways is practically identical with the conditions of the United States. Although our Railway Commission has power to regulate freight charges and, apparently, to protect the shipper of merchandise from exorbitant rates for freight, the relief is neither so direct nor so certain as it would be if competition were provided by the water route from east to west and vice versa, and here, as in the other cases already stated, the discrimination against Canada is apparent. American shippers have the benefit of a coastwise trade free from tolls. The Canadian shipper has no such privilege.

Looking into these various forms of discrimination to which I have referred, more closely, certain consequences are observable. First, a toll upon Canadian shipping will necessarily affect shipping as already stated, will affect the price and supply of lumber used in shipbuilding, will affect the merchants who furnish supplies for vessels engaged in the coasting trade, will affect the employment of sailors and other laborers necessary for every voyage, and these are all important considerations. Besides, there is a growing trade now which is really a coasting trade between the eastern and the western ports of Canada. Mr. E. R. Johnson, to whom I have already referred, states that the direct trade between Canadian ports and British Columbia in 1910 amounted to 118,407 tons, and between the Atlantic and Gulf ports of the United States and British Columbia, to 699,075 tons.

Shortening of the distance between Montreal, Halifax and Vancouver will, no doubt, greatly increase that trade. Why should we submit to its being hampered by a discrimination which I am quite certain was never intended when the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was negotiated. Senator Lodge was good enough to say that Canadians could avoid the tolls on the coastwise traffic by shipping by American railways to an American port, and thence, by a coasting vessel to an American port on the opposite coast, and thence, by American railways to its destination in Canada. While Senator Lodge is entitled to our thanks for thus relieving us from an apparent difficulty, he has evidently forgotten that the relief proposed is substantially a contribution to American railways and American shipping at the expense of Canada.

Having stated the objection which I think can be fairly urged against the action of the United States Congress, let me briefly refer to the Treaty of Washington of 1871, under which the United States Government alleged that American shipping was unfairly treated by the Government of Canada. This treaty contained the following article:

Art. XXVII.—The Government of Her Britannic Majesty engages to urge upon the Government of the Dominion of Canada to secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion, and the Government of the United States engages that the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty shall enjoy the use of the St. Clair Flats canal on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States, and further engages to urge upon the state Government to secure to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty the use of the several state canals connected with the navigation of the lakes or rivers traversed by, or contiguous to the boundary line between the possessions of the high contracting parties on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States.

Acting, as it believed, within its rights under the Washington Treaty, and for the purpose of meeting the expense of working the Welland Canal System of Canada, the Canadian Government imposed a toll of 20 cents per ton on all freight passing through the Welland canal, whether carried in American vessels or Canadian vessels. In the case of freight east bound it was provided that a rebate of 18 cents per ton should be allowed if the boat went as far as Montreal, and

that if on the course, say from Duluth, Chicago or any other American city, cargoes should be unloaded and load again on Canadian territory, the rebate would be allowed. The American Government objected to this rebate as a discrimination against American vessels carrying freight to the ports of the United States on the Atlantic seaboard or on Lake Ontario.

On this subject President Cleveland in a message to Congress on August 23rd, 1888, said:

I desire to call the attention of Congress to a subject involving such wrongs and unfair treatment to our citizens as in my opinion require prompt action. The navigation of the Great Lakes and the immense business and carrying trade growing out of the same have been treated broadly and liberally by the United States Government and made free to all mankind, while Canadian railroads and navigation companies share in our country's transportation upon terms as favorable as are accorded to our own citizens. The canals and other public works built and maintained by the Government along the line of the lakes are made free to all.

By article XXVII of the Treaty of 1871, the provision was made to secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion of Canada on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion, and to also secure to the subjects of Great Britain the use of the St. Clair Flats canal on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States.

The equality of the inhabitants of the Dominion which we were promised in the use of the canals of Canada did not secure to us freedom from tolls in their navigation. But we had a right to expect that we, being Americans and interested in American commerce, would be no more burdened in regard to the same than Canadians engaged in their own trade, and the whole spirit of the concession made was, or should have been, that merchandise and property transported to an American market through these canals should not be enhanced in its costs by tolls many times higher than such as were carried to an adjoining Canadian market. All our citizens, producers and consumers, as well as vessel owners, were to enjoy the equality promised.

To promise equality and then to practice it conditional upon our vessels doing Canadian business

instead of their own is to fulfil a promise with the shadow of performance. I recommend that such legislative action be taken as will give Canadian vessels navigating our canals, and their cargoes, precisely the advantages granted to our vessels and cargoes upon Canadian canals, and that the same be measured by exactly the same rule of discrimination.

The course which I have outlined and the recommendations made relate to the honor and dignity of our country and the protection and preservation of the rights and interests of all people.

A government does but half its duty when it protects its citizens at home and permits them to be imposed upon and humiliated by the unfair and overreaching disposition of other nations.

If we invite our people to rely upon arrangements made for their benefit abroad, we should see to it that they are not deceived; and if we are generous and liberal to a neighboring country our people should reap the advantage of it by a return of liberality and generosity.

President Harrison several times commented on this subject. In a message under date of February 23, 1892, he says:

In the matter of canal tolls our treaty was flagrantly disregarded.

In speaking of the discriminations practised, he says in a message of June 20, 1892:

The report of Mr. Partridge, the solicitor of the Department of State, which accompanies the letters of the Secretary of State, states these discriminations very clearly. That these orders as to canal tolls and rebates are in direct violation of Article XXVII of the treaty of 1871 seems to be clear. It is wholly evasive to say that there is no discrimination between Canadian and American vessels; that the rebate is allowed to both without favor upon grain carried through to Montreal or transhipped at a Canadian port to Montreal. The treaty runs:—

To secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion. It was intended to give to consumers in the United States, to our people engaged in railroad transportation, and to those exporting from our ports equal terms in passing their merchandise through these

canals. This absolute equality of treatment was the consideration for concessions on the part of this Government made in the same article of the treaty, and which have been faithfully kept. It is a matter of regret that the Canadian Government has not responded promptly to our request for the removal of these discriminating tolls.

In another message, of July 1, 1892, he says:

There can be no doubt that a serious discrimination against our citizens and our commerce exists, and quite as little doubt that this discrimination is not the incident but the purpose of the Canadian regulation.

This question was taken up in Congress, and the House and Senate by a unanimous vote authorized the President to issue a proclamation to take steps in retaliation. In pursuance of this Act, which was passed July 26, 1892, President Harrison, on the 18th of August, 1892, issued the following proclamation:

And whereas the Government of the Dominion of Canada imposes a toll amounting to about 20 cents per ton on all freight passing through the Welland canal in transit to a port of the United States, and also a further toll on all vessels of the United States and on all passengers in transit to a port of the United States, all of which tolls are without rebate; and

Whereas the Government of the Dominion of Canada, in accordance with an Order in Council of April 4, 1892, refunds 18 cents per ton of the 20 cent toll at the Welland canal on wheat, Indian corn, peas, barley, rye, oats, flaxseed and buckwheat, upon condition that they are originally shipped for and carried to Montreal or some port east of Montreal for export, and that if transshipped at an intermediate point such transshipment is made within the Dominion of Canada, but allows no such nor any other rebate on said products when shipped to a port of the United States or when carried to Montreal for export if transshipped within the United States; and

Whereas the Government of the Dominion of Canada by said system of rebate and otherwise discriminates against the citizens of the United States in the use of said Welland canal, in violation of the provisions of article 27 of the treaty of Washington concluded May 8, 1871; and

Whereas said Welland canal is connected with the navigation of the Great Lakes, and I am satisfied that the passage through it of cargoes in transit to ports of the United States is made difficult and burdensome by said discriminating system of rebate and otherwise and is reciprocally unjust and unreasonable;

Now, therefore, I, Benjamin Harrison, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power to that end conferred upon me by said Act of Congress approved July 26, 1892, do hereby direct that from and after September 1, 1892, until further notice a toll of 20 cents per ton be levied, collected and paid on all freight of whatever kind or description passing through the St. Mary's Falls canal in transit to any port of the Dominion of Canada, whether carried in vessels of the United States or of other nations; and to that extent I do hereby suspend from and after said date the right of free passage through said St. Mary's Falls canal of any and all cargoes or portions of cargoes in transit to Canadian ports.

From this action of the American Government with respect to a discrimination or what was regarded as discrimination on American vessels passing through the Welland canal, one can learn how the term "equality" was construed in 1892, just twenty years ago. President Cleveland declared that the rebate of 18 cents per ton on Canadian freight was unfair treatment, "showed a narrow and ungenerous commercial spirit," "was to fulfil a promise with the shadow of performance," and recommended that the action of the Canadian Government should be "measured by exactly the same rule of discrimination."

President Harrison said February 23rd, 1892:

"The matter of canal tolls of treaty rights were flagrantly disregarded." And again in a message of June 20th, 1892, he said: "It is wholly evasive to say that there is no discrimination between Canadian and American vessels;" and again in his proclamation of August 18th, 1892, he said:

The passage of cargoes through the Welland canal in transit to ports in the United States is made difficult and burdensome by said discriminating system of rebate and otherwise, and is reciprocally unjust and unreasonable.

In closing this speech, already too long, I may be allowed to summarize as briefly as possible the position of Canada with regard to the action of Congress at its last session.

1. We accept the interpretation of Congress of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with regard to our foreign trade, as it places our foreign trade on the same basis as the foreign trade of the United States and of "all nations."

2. It is not necessary for our purpose that we should dispute the right of the United States to allow its own coastwise shipping the free use of the Panama canal, provided a similar privilege is extended to the coastwise shipping in Canada. We insist that there shall be no "discrimination," and that the terms "entire equality" shall apply to our shipping whether or not the United States imposes tolls on its own coastwise shipping or permits such shipping the free use of the canal.

3. In every treaty affecting the canal since the first treaty of 1846 with New Granada down to the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901, the avowed policy of all parties to such treaties was that the canal should be open on terms of equality to all nations, and that this view was strengthened by lapse of time is shown in the definite and comprehensive terms of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty to that end.

4. That every President of the United States, from President Polk to President Roosevelt, in their written messages to Congress, confirmed this view in terms even more comprehensive than the restricted language of the treaties concerned.

5. That in the diplomatic correspondence of several Secretaries of State, no indication whatever was given that the United States, as a party to the treaties, claimed to itself any preference or right to which all nations affected by the treaty would not be equally entitled.

6. That the action of the United States with regard to the alleged discrimination of Canada in the use of the Welland canal by American shipping shows how strictly the Washington treaty was construed where American interests were involved, and that the example of Canada in that case encourages the hope that the United States will remove all discrimination against Canada's coastwise shipping.

7. That to retain the present tolls on Canadian coastwise shipping, contrary, as I believe, to the letter and the spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, will be regarded in Canada as an injustice tending to disturb the friendly relations between two great countries, which have a mutual interest in developing the resources of North America, and in facilitating transportation between its widely separated coasts and seaports, and also to deepen the impression that every treaty between the United States and Great Britain, in which we were interested, was interpreted to the disadvantage of Canada territorially and commercially.

With this summary, the only question that now remains to be considered is: Have we any remedy? We cannot submit quietly to injustice, particularly where such important interests are concerned, nor should we resort to retaliation, unless all other efforts to obtain redress have failed. We have enjoyed one hundred years of peace with the United States, although the atmosphere has several times been more or less agitated by differences, all of which, happily, have been settled either by arbitration or by diplomatic correspondence with the Government at Washington. We have every confidence that, in this case, what diplomacy has done before it will do again, and if the Government of Canada has not already remonstrated against the action of Congress, it is to be hoped it will do so without delay. I have every confidence in its anxiety to protect Canadian interests, and that in doing so, within the limits of diplomatic courtesy, it will be supported by the people of Canada.

Should the Washington Government still refuse, notwithstanding the protest from Canada, or from the Foreign Office, or from the Imperial Government, which has already, I understand, entered a protest, then an appeal should be made to the Hague Tribunal, to which the Government of Great Britain and the United States have bound themselves to submit the interpretation of treaties. Canada is willing to abide by the decision of that Tribunal. If we have no rights under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, we are prepared to abide by the result. We believe that the best men in the United States consider such an appeal eminently proper, and that any refusal on the part of the United States to refer the question to the Hague Tribunal would be discreditable to the American nation. On this point let me quote from a speech delivered by ex-Secretary of State Elihu Root, before the New York Chamber of Commerce. He said:

We are now approaching a question which will test the willingness of the American people to be true to the ideals of self-government, showing that a democracy can be honorable and just. Under an agreement made regarding the Panama Canal, Great Britain retired from her position and signed over to the United States all the rights she had under the partnership agreement. It was specified that the ships of all nations were to have the same treatment. Our Congress passed a law which gives free transit to American ships engaged in the coastwise trade while passing between our Atlantic coast and our Pacific coast, while

tolls are to be imposed upon British ships passing between British ports on the Atlantic and British ports on the Pacific, and upon all other foreign ships. The question now is, what is to be done about it? We have a treaty with Great Britain under which we have agreed that all questions arising upon the interpretation of treaties shall be submitted to arbitration, and it seems hardly conceivable, yet there are men who say that we will never arbitrate the question of the construction of that treaty (the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty), and I say to you that if we refuse to arbitrate it we will be in the position of the merchant who is known to all the world to be false to his promises. (Applause.) . . . Among all the people of the earth who hope for better days of righteousness and peace, we will stand, in the light of our multitude of declarations for arbitration and peace, discredited, dishonored hypocrites, with the fair name of America blackened, with the self-respect of Americans gone, with the influence of America for advance along the pathway of progress and civilization annulled, dishonored and disgraced. That question stands among us, and no true American can fail to use his voice upon that question for his country's honor. (Applause.) If we are lovers of liberty and justice, if we are willing to do as a nation what we are bound to do as individuals in our communities, then all the questions we have been discussing will be solved right, and for countless generations to come Americans will still be brothers as they were of old, leading the world towards happier lives and nobler manhood, towards the realization of the dreams of philosophers and of the prophets for a better and a nobler world.

If I were expressing the opinion of Canada in regard to the Treaty and in regard to the action of the American nation, I would even hesitate to use such forcible language as I have quoted from ex-Secretary Root, but he is not alone in this opinion. The leading journals of the United States, from New York to San Francisco, have expressed themselves in terms equally forcible.

I shall, therefore, content myself in assuming the attitude with regard to Canada which President Cleveland assumed in the dispute over the tolls on the Welland Canal. "A government does but half its duty when it protects its citizens at home and permits them to be imposed upon and humiliated by the unfair and overreaching disposition of other nations."

To these words let me add that the Senate of Canada will be doing but half its duty if it does not render such assistance as in its power lies to sustain the government in enforcing the rights of Canada in the present instance, and in supporting any effort it may make to see those rights vindicated, and justice done to the Canadian people.

(November 11th, 1912.)

Standards.

BY HON. S. H. BLAKE, K.C.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club on the 11th Nov., Hon. S. H. Blake said:

I was asked most kindly by your President and the Secretary to speak some afternoon to the Canadian Club. I received from him the statement that I might speak on any subject that I pleased, and say what was pleasing to myself. I mentioned that to a friend of mine, and he said, "The Chairman might as well have given you the permission, for you would have taken it anyway." That shows how unkind and untruthful people may be!

I said that I would like to give a little talk—if I even desired it I am not an eloquent man, and I have lived long enough to endorse the statement made by a friend of mine yesterday, who went to hear a celebrated divine, an eloquent man, and I said, "What did he talk about?" "Well," he said, "I really don't know; I was so carried away with the language." "But," I said, "can you not give me the text?" "I can't," said he. "Well," I said, "what was the sermon about?" "Really, I don't know," he replied, "all I can say is, it was an eloquent sermon." Now, I am beginning to have very much the same idea of eloquence, and I say, even if I could be eloquent, I think it would be unwise, because I desire to give a serious talk this afternoon.

You will permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, before I commence, that I began to think when outside that it was Indian summer, it was so beautiful but was just a little doubtful until I came in here and found, from the smoke, that it certainly is Indian summer! (Laughter.)

About seventy years ago, a junior partner of one of those counsel that used to delight the audience attending a jury trial, said to me, "Do you know, that when the leading counsel

*Hon. Samuel Hume Blake, K.C., is too well known to Canadians to require any lengthy biographical note. A leader of the Provincial Bar, he was formerly Vice-Chancellor of Ontario and a Governor of the University of Toronto. He is a strong Evangelical, and has long been noted for his activity in evangelical movements and for his quiet benevolence in connection with many good causes.

on the other side in his address got up and quietly made his way over to the jury box, the other counsel would whisper to me, 'There's that fellow going to *talk* to the jury!' " He knew that he could get hold of them by just *talking* to them! The eloquence would be all gone, the meat or essence would not be found, and nothing but words, eloquent though they might be, would be left. I would like to have a little of the persuasive quality of that very celebrated lawyer, and have a little *talk* with the Canadian Club this afternoon.

It is a matter of vital moment to us to have true standards. We have standards for gold, and standards for silver, and standards for wheat, and standards for oats, and standards for butter, and standards for cheese. People that don't regard these standards find the way into the place whence there is no means of exit to them for some months. Now, if it be so necessary to have these standards for material matters, is it not a thousand-fold more necessary that we have standards for our life, the standards that will make the soul of the nation, the standards that will be the spring of action, the standards that will uplift, and not only uplift the individual who lives up to them, but also will uplift those that he touches. It should be a matter ever to be remembered by this Club,—that your duty does not begin and end with self, your duty is carried far beyond that, your influence should be felt by any person whose life you can mould, anyone who needs the good, honest grasp of a Canadian to lift him higher, and give him better and truer views of life. These, these are the aims and objects, I presume, of this Club. If not, Mr. Chairman, they should be made its aims and objects. (Applause.) Each one might and should in his place in our city do something to forward the great object of forming a nation, that is to take the standard of other lands?—by no means! We propose to set a standard that is higher than the standard of any nation, no matter how high that may be—untrammelled with old rules, with old regulations, and with old ideas; here, thank God! we are starting afresh in the race of life, here we are untrammelled by what may have preceded us, here we are a nation in the forming, with the possibility of setting such an ideal standard that people can look back and say, "Thank God for the Canadian Club! At a period of time when we are beginning to grow, it, a great and increasing band, undertook not merely to set standards, for many can do that in their studies—but to set high standards, and to live them, to be walking standards so that all might look and may follow." If that be the object it is a grand one, and we do not begin it with the stain

of the opium, the slave or any other like trade. We don't begin it with the sin of adding a little to our income by such means, for although the opium trade might add five million pounds sterling a year to Britain, it brought an incalculable curse to China and continued it there with the cost of two wars which she dragged cruelly out of the heathen nation in its struggle to avert this evil. What a marvellous contrast between the standard of heathen China and that of Christian England! One of the first acts of this heathen nation when, as she is, coming into her own is her edict, "No opium! Put this curse introduced by Christian England out of our land!" May we ever keep free from such black spots in our history and in our integrity valiantly proceed with the great work which is now entrusted to us.

How varied are the opinions of people upon the subject of standards. Not long since a man known in our city died, and some months ago a friend of mine came into my office and said, "They say So-and-so's life is a failure." "His life a failure? Man!" I said, "what is your standard?" The voice was loud, but only gave due expression to the deeply moved spirit. "Man, what is your standard? Didn't he live a pure life, and a true life, and an honest life, and an uplifting life? Did he not sacrifice self, and did he not seek only to do that which was for the welfare of others? He never went into the Town of Carnal Policy and there dwelt. Compromise and expediency were cast out of his dictionary. He never companied with Mr. Facing-both-ways, or lived in the same street with Mr. By-ends. He never struggled for place or for Position, or ran after that which the world is running after. Do you say that life is a failure? That life is a sacred heritage to the Canadian people?" That is a life the memory of which is to be handed down. The standard was four-square to the world. That is a life that we Canadians may well be proud of, and this Canadian Club may well seek to repeat it in many of its members, and through them in tens of thousands in our Dominion. (Applause.)

That life a failure! Give me for a moment of time an opportunity of presenting a vision. When the supreme day comes when we shall all have to stand before the great Judge, and when on His throne He sits, I can see Him beckoning to the man whose life was a 'failure'—to sit up on the throne beside Him. I can hear Him say, "Come up, my son, and help me to judge those men who thought your life and mine were failures." And as He stretches out that hand I can see in it the stigmas of the nails that entered into it, driven in

by the world that said His life also, was a failure. It was too high a life for the world to understand. "Come up and help me to judge those who thought that your life and my life was a failure."

I want to set before you this afternoon no lower standard than that! I want that you shall not seek to live a life on any lower standard. And I want you to seek, in season and out of season, to impress upon people that the life of truth, the life of honesty, the life of uprightness, the life of integrity, and the life of sacrifice for others, is not a failure, but it is the grand standard of life, to be followed and to be cherished.

They say I am a fossil. (Laughter.) Mr. President, if what I say proves me a fossil, thank God that I am placed in that splendid category! But, being a fossil, let me call back just a few of those matters that make me a fossil. A person said, "I wish you would give me a few reminiscences." One of the—I am not going to give them, so the old people here need not be alarmed! (Laughter and applause)—but one of the earliest pictures before my mind is the Hon. Robert Baldwin. He lived very nearly opposite to us, and as he constantly walked in his integrity and in his uprightness past the window at which I was studying my lessons, I said, "I would like to live a life as true and as upright as the life of that man!" And let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that one of the great wants of the young men of to-day, and one of the reasons why I impress it with all my force and power this afternoon, is that they look almost in vain for such manly men to-day. Don't let the standard deteriorate! Start here such a standard, and see that it is lived! We had in our youth the enormous advantage of people of that class, we touched those hands, we heard their voices, we viewed their lives, we got their advice, and we learned from them, that for ourselves, for our true happiness, for our country, and for the general good, there was to be an undeviating standard of integrity and uprightness.

I remember how it struck me in reading Carlyle's History of Frederick the Great, when it came to the time of his deep anxiety as to who should be his successor on the throne, when he thought of the difficulties that he had had, and of the greater difficulties, that with his vision he saw coming, he determined that he must have a ruler with strength of character, a man with nobility of mind and ready in action. He took much pains with the education of his two nephews, one of whom he determined should be the king after him. One

day, passing through the school room, he found there the lad, afterwards King Frederick William. He was very anxious that he should be a proficient scholar in French—you know the language here, I think (Laughter)—in French, simply because it was the diplomatic language of those days. Taking down Lafontaine's Fables, he said to the boy, "Translate me that fable." He did it excellently well; and the King putting his hand on the boy's shoulder, commended him for the progress he was making. The lad said to him, "Sire, I think it but right to say, I should not have been able to translate it so well but that I had it for my lesson yesterday." That is the class of boy no doubt you are bringing up in our ordinary schools! I will give you five dollars for every such boy to-day! Frederick William years after said, "I never will forget the hand put on my shoulder and around me as he commended my truthfulness, and commended my honesty, in not bearing away the meed of praise that I had not earned. He took me out in front of the Potsdam Palace, where there was a great obelisk, and continuing to commend me, said, speaking in French" (we are not all educated up to that, Mr. Chairman), "speaking French, he pointed to the great monolith and said, 'Sa droiteur fait sa force! Its uprightness is its strength.' And still insisting on that attitude of absolute uprightness even on the throne, and amidst all circumstances, we walked up and down on the terrace." Frederick William said, "Many a time after that, filled with trouble and threatened with attacks on my Kingdom, as surrounding nations offered me help and assistance on degrading terms, I walked up and down in front of the Potsdam Palace, and thinking of my old uncle and his early lesson 'Sa droiteur fait sa force' I said, *ma droiteur fait ma force*—Let that be my strength! And let me reject any course of action and any offered friendship which involves a sacrifice of right."

Suffer another illustration. I was very much struck with it. A man, in dealing with the question of standards, took out his watch on the platform, and said to one of the audience, "What's the hour by your watch?" We will call it "Ten minutes to two." To another, "By yours?" "Five minutes to two." "By yours?" "Two o'clock." Now if I go down the whole of Broadway, and set my watch by the time of every man that I meet,—what would be the result of it? I'll ruin my watch, and I won't have the right time at the end of it. But, that's what you in this Assembly Hall are doing in your daily lives; *you* are setting your conduct by that man that has been a little longer in business than you, and *you* are setting

your conduct by him that is alongside of you; *you* are justifying yourself because *he* did it, or because another did it, and if he is a man that is especially looked up to, then all the more I am completely shielded by what *he* does. If I want to set my watch, I go to the sun: there I get the true time, and I set my watch by it! And you, if you want to get your standard, go you to that sun intended to guide the world, go to your Bible, and thereby set your conduct, and by nothing lower! That Bible, which from Genesis to Revelation is full of righteousness, thinking right, talking right, doing right, amidst all the never-to-be-depended upon and ever-changing standards of the world! Let this Canadian Club write that word in letters so large that it can be seen from one end of Canada to the other, **RIGHTEOUSNESS** is the standard that we must have, and we begin it by living it ourselves.

One more little anecdote. I feel the chairman pulling the tail of my coat,—if he were in Ireland he dare not do that!—but I want to give you two thoughts in connection with this, and I want you to bear them away with you. A lad was passing over a canal on an early June day, and he had over his shoulder a stick, on which were suspended his belongings. A man said to him, an old teamster on the canal—mark, an old teamster on the canal—"Well, William, where are you going?" The lad replied, "You know, sir, the family is getting large, and the business is not increasing, and I have got to go out into the world, and I have to do for myself." "Well," he said, "William, what business are you going into?" He said, "You know, father had the little soap factory down there near the canal; and soap making is the only thing that I know anything about, and I suppose I must go up to Philadelphia and try to make my way there." "Well," says this—I emphasize it—*old teamster*, "William, take two thoughts from me into your work: one is, make the very best article that you can, no shams, no pretences, no 'This-is-as-good-as-that'—make, William, the best article that you can; and my second is, give every man that you deal with sixteen ounces to the pound." And William said, "I plodded along, and those thoughts came working in my mind, and I resolved they shall be the mottoes of William Colgate." And at a time when he could write his name to a cheque for millions of dollars, he stood on the platform saying: "William Colgate's success has been based on doing the very best that he could, and on giving every man I dealt with sixteen ounces to the pound."

The question is not whether you will probably be found out in your wrong; it is not a question of making a little more or less money; but it is the injury that you do to yourselves, the self-weakening that is inflicted by dropping down to the low level of doing a mean or dishonourable action. You are weakening yourselves, your self-respect. Markino, the Japanese artist, who came to study in London, Paris, Vienna, and San Francisco, and who went many days without a meal, working and toiling as an artist, wrote back to his friends words I think it worth while for any young man to read. He stated, that of all the people he had met he liked the English best, but he made one qualification in his likings: while commending their kindness shown in many actions, "There was one thing," he said, "that I did not find in the English people (and to a Japanese ancestor-worshipper it was a great omission,) I did not find the quality of *bushito*,"—doing right because it is right, doing right because of the respect that you owe to yourself, doing right because of your ancestors, doing right because of your name, immaterial whether any man sees or finds it out, immaterial who may be there. *Bushito*! Do the right because it is the right! Do the right! *Sa droiteur fait sa force*! It is an amazing thing to me, now in my seventy-eighth year, to look back over so many people that have made dead failures, because to them there was no bushito standard. The men who succeeded and whose children are succeeding, were those who lived the high motto "noblesse oblige."

Just one little instance of that. A friend of mine many years ago said to me, going into his large wholesale warehouse: Last week a man came in here to deal with me. One of my salesmen came up and said, "Blank is buying a large parcel, sir." "Indeed," said I, "Blank! I think I know that name. Go down to the bookkeeper and bring me up the full name and address of that man," and he did. "Why," I said to the salesman, "that is the man that cheated us; that's the man that made the bad failure; that's the man that dishonestly left his creditors with a few cents on the dollar! Go down and tell the buyer not to serve him!" The buyer came up, and he said: "Why, sir, the parcel is very large, and he is going to pay cash for it." "Never put one dollar of his money into my establishment! Put all those goods back into their places, and tell him we don't deal with such men." My friend hadn't what they call "the yellow itch." (Laughter.) He gave a lesson to that man when he taught him "There is something better than money, it is character, and it goes farther. I will not soil myself by allowing such men to come in and deal in my establishment."

This merchant died a man of wealth. He was true to the true standard. He died honored. He died a Senator of the Dominion—don't mistake me! I am not saying that this is a never failing certificate of character. (Laughter.) But he died respected by all and loved by many; and he died living his standard. "*Sa droiteur fait sa force.*"

I thank you. I have given about one-quarter of what I intended, but I have been led away here and there, and I must now close. I desire, however, to say this, that if you do me the honor of electing me a member of this Club I shall be very glad to join. (Applause.) I am not depreciating at all, of course—I put it first, the place it should occupy—the Irish Protestant Benevolent Society. (Laughter.) Some man will say St. Andrew's Society stands first—let him have it. Some St. George's Society—very well. But I would like to see a strong, national, Canadian Club, that knows no nationality except as we Canadians are a nation, with our own standard of patriotism, of right, of kindness, of consideration for others, endeavoring to have that standard raised throughout the whole of this land, giving way to no standard of any other nation or people, but setting above all their standards the Canadian standard. No body of people should have more to do with forming, preserving, and living this standard than the Canadian Club of Canada. (Long applause.)

(November 18, 1912.)

Northern Ontario.

BY THE HONORABLE W. H. HEARST, K.C., M.P.P.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club on the 18th November, Mr. Hearst said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,—I am sure that I feel highly honored indeed in having the great privilege of addressing the Canadian Club in this city, a Club that has already done so much for Canadian sentiment and for national life, and that I believe is destined to do very much more, not only in the elevation of its ideals of national life, but for the general development of Canada.

The subject I have chosen for the few remarks I shall make this afternoon is perhaps not in line with those you generally have treated here, but I trust it will prove not uninteresting to you, because I believe the heritage we have in the northern portion of this province is of supreme importance, not only to the Province of Ontario, but to the Dominion of Canada, and to the whole British Empire, of which we form an important part. Therefore, I hope you will bear with me while I give you some statistics as to the magnitude of Northern Ontario, its areas, its resources and the possibilities of its future.

Let us look for a moment at the size of this Province of Ontario. Prior to the addition of the District of Patricia, Ontario contained 260,862 square miles. The District of Patricia contains 157,400 square miles, equal to over 60 per cent. of the former area of Ontario. This makes a total present area of the province of 418,262 square miles, making the Province of Ontario the largest province in the whole Dominion except Quebec, the Province of British Columbia coming third.

Now to speak more particularly of the district we call New or Northern Ontario. I wish to treat this territory apart from and outside of the District of Patricia, for although the District of Patricia forms, I believe, an important part of the

* The Hon. William Howard Hearst, K.C., M.P.P., is Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines in the Whitney Government. He sits for Sault Ste. Marie in the Conservative interest, and is one of the strongest men in the Ministry. Possessed of much native force and ability, he is a rapid and effective public speaker, and is likely to go far in Canadian politics.

province and possesses possibilities of great importance, yet for the present time we have so many undeveloped minerals, timber and agricultural resources so much nearer, that it may be some time before we are called upon to develop those in the District of Patricia. So in the figures I shall give you, I do not propose to take much account of the District of Patricia. First, let us consider the area. We have in New Ontario, outside of the Great Lakes, 175,500 square miles, distributed as follows: west of Port Arthur, 41,500 square miles; east of Port Arthur and south of the Height of Land, 52,000 square miles; north of the Height of Land and east of Port Arthur, 82,000 square miles; making a total of 175,500 square miles. I divide it into these sections in order that you can perhaps get a better conception of the vastness of that great country. A great many people, particularly in Toronto, have the idea that Northern Ontario consists entirely of the Temiskaming region, and that when they have taken a trip up the line of the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway to Cochrane and seen the section of country tributary to that line, they have seen Northern Ontario; whereas, they might travel a thousand miles west of that line and all the way through a country rich in natural resources awaiting development, and still be within the limits of Northern Ontario.

We have some 140,000,000 acres in Ontario, outside of the Great Lakes. Of this the province has surveyed 46,000,000 acres, leaving unsurveyed 94,000,000 acres. We have sold or alienated from the Crown only 24,000,000 acres, leaving 116,000,000 acres still in the Crown; and I understand from statistics compiled by the Department of Agriculture that we have under cultivation only 13,231,000 acres, or less than 10 per cent. of what still remains in the Crown in the right of the province.

Then what have we from an agricultural standpoint in that North Land? We have what is known as the Clay Belt, consisting of 20,000,000 acres; but that is not by any means all that we have from an agricultural standpoint. In the Districts of Nipissing, Sudbury, Manitoulin Island, Algoma, Thunder Bay, Rainy River and Kenora, we have millions of acres just as well adapted for agriculture, just as fertile, as in the Clay Belt or anywhere else in Ontario,—just as fertile, I believe, as can be found anywhere in the world to-day. In other words, we have an area in Northern Ontario capable of profitable cultivation two or three times as large in extent as that now under cultivation in the province.

That being so, let us look now at the agricultural production of the province. The value of Canada's field crops in 1911 amounted to \$565,711,600; the value of Ontario's field crops was in the same year \$193,260,000, or considerably more than one-third of the whole Dominion. The reports for the same year also show us that the field crops of the Province of Ontario were nearly \$13,000,000 greater in value than the field crops of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, the two largest producing provinces of the West! When you stop to think of that, that the field crops of Ontario are worth over twelve million dollars more than the combined production of the two largest prairie provinces, what will the result be when all the tens of millions of acres of Ontario's arable lands are brought under cultivation for the benefit of mankind and of the world at large?

I can only, in the time at my disposal this afternoon, speak very hurriedly of the different points, so I pass on from the agricultural possibilities of Northern Ontario to deal with some of the others. I will speak for a moment of Ontario's minerals. The production of minerals in 1911 amounted to \$41,432,898, an increase over 1904 of \$29,860,251, or practically thirty million dollars. The silver production in 1911 amounted to \$15,949,019, or practically sixteen million dollars. Cobalt to date has produced 125,571,980 ounces of silver, yielding the mine owners, up to the end of 1911, \$64,317,352. In 1911 the Cobalt mines paid in dividends \$8,588,916. Up to the end of 1911 the total dividends paid by the Cobalt mines outside of the returns from privately owned mines and those owned by close corporations, amounted to \$30,391,095. We have something to boast of in our mineral output, particularly during the last six or seven years; and when I tell you that we have prospected over only a small portion of the province yet, and that we have millions upon millions of acres that have yet to hear the sound of the prospector's pick, I think you will get some idea of the possibilities of the province from a mineral point of view in the days to come. We are proud of our mineral production, placing Ontario as it does in the forefront of the mineral-producing countries of the world; one ounce in every seven of the silver that comes from the earth's crust comes from Cobalt.

And we have not only the silver camp at Cobalt, and a splendid gold camp at Porcupine; but besides these, there are deposits of gold or silver at Webbwood, Michipicoten, Port Arthur, Atikokan, Lake of the Woods, and in fact there are traces of these precious metals all the way from Quebec to

Manitoba. How many of these deposits will become paying mines, no one can tell; but no one who has studied the geology of that country will say that there are not many deposits outside of the deposits at Cobalt and at Porcupine that look exceedingly promising. And just as the Temiskaming & Northern Railway opened up the Cobalt and Porcupine camps, and the Canadian Pacific opened up the Sudbury nickel deposits, so will additional Cobalts and Porcupines and Sudburys undoubtedly be opened up in that great North land when other railroad lines and wagon roads are built there.

Speaking in connection with the Sudbury mines, it is a matter of satisfaction to think that 70 per cent. of the nickel of the world is produced in that camp.

We are very proud of our position as a mineral-producing province compared with other provinces. Canada's total mineral output in 1911 was \$105,000,000, while the value of the minerals produced in Ontario in 1911 was \$42,000,000, or 40 per cent. of the output of the Dominion. Omitting coal, of which none is produced by Ontario (except "white coal" of the Adam Beck type), Ontario produces more than one half of the mineral product of the Dominion, and in mining metals 65 per cent. And in 1912 so far the mineral production has far exceeded that of 1911. Take it for the first nine months, the total production is approximately \$25,000,000. The gold produced in the first nine months of 1912 is \$1,117,335, much more than twice as much as was ever produced in any previous 24 months in Ontario. And our silver production for this year, while slightly less in quantity than for the first nine months of 1911, exceeds it in value by \$1,114,000, this being caused by the increase in the value of silver this year over the year before.

So much for our mineral possibilities in Northern Ontario. Now let me speak for a moment of our timber resources. No one can overestimate the importance of the timber resources of Ontario and of the Dominion; and not only in the matter of the timber industry itself but in respect of its great impetus which it lends to almost every other industry and to the commerce of the country in general. Take the timber in the Crown. Our estimates, which are not at all complete, and which I am sure are far below the actual quantities, show that we have red and white pine on lands in the Crown amounting to 13,500,000,000 feet, worth at least \$10 a thousand feet, or in all, \$135,000,000. We have pine on licensed lands, (that is land upon which the timber has been sold to timber licensees, but in respect of which the Govern-

ment has an interest till the timber is cut,) amounting to at least 7,000,000,000 feet, which will yield to the Crown a dollar and a half a thousand, a total of \$10,500,000. We have at least 300,000,000 cords of pulpwood, 22½ million feet of which is capable of being sawn into lumber and worth at least \$225,000,000. So we have on a conservative basis an asset in our timber alone, looking at it from the standpoint of revenue, of at least \$370,500,000.

Look at what our timber has done for us in the way of revenue from Confederation; up to the end of October, 1910, the total revenue was \$44,044,165.15; or an average of over a million dollars a year.

That you may understand and appreciate better the importance of our timber assets in this country, I would call your attention to the fact that in 1911 the timber cut in Canada was valued at \$77,503,167, of which Ontario's share was \$30,011,009, or nearly one half the whole. The forest products of the Dominion in 1910 were estimated at \$166,000,000, or \$22 for every inhabitant of the whole Dominion. These figures surely demand from us the greatest attention to this important asset. These figures require, and I say frankly that great care and consideration should be exercised by the Government of the day to see that our timber is preserved and conserved as far as practicable for the future, at the same time giving the best and widest returns which can be afforded at the present day for our industries as well as from the standpoint of revenue. Something has been done along that line. One of the most important steps that has been taken is the establishment of forest reserves for the purpose of preserving the timber for future use, and preventing its destruction by cutting or fire or otherwise. We are greatly increasing these areas from time to time by acquiring licenses from lumbermen granted years ago, and from time to time this policy of adding portions of forest to the reserves will, I have no doubt, be acted upon.

Of these forest reserves, we have at the present time one at Temagami, containing 5,900 square miles, in which there stands about five billion feet of pine; one at Mississauga, comprising 3,000 square miles, containing three billion feet of pine; one at Nipigon of 7,300 square miles, containing ten to fifteen million cords of pulpwood; one at Sibley of 70 square miles, for the purpose of conserving the timber and preserving the beauty of the Cape; a small reserve called the Eastern Reserve, of 100 square miles, on which the pine is all cut away but where the new growth is being protected; the reserve at

Quetico, comprising 1,560 square miles, containing one and a half billion feet of red and white pine and two million cords of spruce; the Algonquin Park, comprising 2,066 square miles, and Rondeau Park, 8 square miles. In all our forest reserves and national parks have a total area of 20,004 square miles, and on them we think we have at least nine and a half billion feet of pine, fifteen million cords of pulpwood, and two million cords of spruce.

The conservation of our forest assets on the best and most practicable basis consistent with our present needs and requirements, constitutes one of the serious problems of the present day. At the present time I have added to the staff of my department an expert forester. (Applause.) One of his duties will be to study this question from every standpoint and give advice on the matter from every aspect. You must remember that you cannot have settlement and at the same time preserve our forests; you can't get settlement and grow crops of vegetables, wheat, etc., on the same ground as trees. Where lands are opened for settlement, you must utilize the timber to the best advantage, for a certain amount of the forest will have to be removed in order to make way for the settler and for civilization. One of the important problems, therefore, is how to utilize that forest in order to bring the best returns to the settler himself and the Province of Ontario as a whole.

With that end in view we have recently arranged for the establishment of a large pulp and paper plant at Abitibi, and the securing of other plants elsewhere, and we will try to utilize these so that the settler will have a market for his timber, and so that at the same time the industries employed in the manufacture of this timber will help in the building up of towns and villages and thus provide markets for the farmers' produce.

In the last sale made by the Province of Ontario in the Jocko country, one of the conditions of sale is that the lumberman must take care of the limbs and debris, destroying them as far as possible so as to prevent danger from fire. The Forester, Mr. Zavitz, is considering the question now as to how this can best be accomplished. This is one of the many problems that confront us.

Then there is a problem, too, as to the harvesting of the ripe timber without injury to the growing timber, for timber gets ripe just as grain or fruit or anything else does. One question we have to face and consider in the development of that great North Land is the keeping of the rough lands

which are unsuited for agriculture as timber reserves. We have to find the best method of harvesting the timber from these to the best advantage without injury to the growing crop of timber, so that an adequate supply may be maintained for the future.

That North country is a wonderful place in the matter of water transportation. The Transcontinental Railroad in its course crosses nine large navigable rivers, having a total length of over 1,795 miles, besides other smaller streams. We have, I think, at least a hundred navigable rivers from the mouth of the Moose River to the Nelson River. This all means that the pulpwood in this region will be floated down these streams to mills at or convenient to the crossing of the railway, and will there be manufactured into either pulp, paper or other wood products.

Now take a look at the importance of the splendid water-powers we have in Northern Ontario. Perhaps no other country in the world is so blessed with hydro-electric power as we are in that great North Land. One of the engineers of my department, Mr. Rorke, estimates that within 100 miles either way from the National Transcontinental Railway over the height of land there is possible of development 2,000,000 horse power. He has made a computation of the possibilities of this asset, and he says, that power from coal costs \$25 to \$150 per h.p., and estimating the energy in the territory to which I have referred at \$50 to \$75 per h.p. per annum, we have a potential asset in these rivers per annum of \$100,000,000 to \$150,000,000. Who can estimate the importance of the power I have just spoken of in the development of that North country? But not only have we power upon the rivers I have referred to, but hydraulic power is abundant everywhere in that North country from one end to the other. Take Rainy Lake, the Lake of the Woods and the rivers flowing out of them, and we have possibilities for power development almost rivalling Niagara itself. Who can estimate the part hydro-electric power will play in the development of Ontario in the future? Much has been accomplished in the way of hydro-electric development in the past five or ten years, but what will the next ten or fifteen years show in this direction? It is no great stretch of imagination to think of the time when we shall not only see our pulp and paper mills run by electricity as they are to-day, our factories operated by electricity as they are to-day, our smelters and concentrators run by electricity as they are to-day, our streets and city homes lighted by electricity as they are to-day, but

when we shall see it used to heat and light the settler's home, to cut the settler's trees, to saw the settler's lumber, to stump and plow the settler's land, to cut and thresh the settler's grain, to milk the settler's cows, to churn his butter and bake his bread. (Laughter.) All these things and more will, I believe, be performed in the future by electricity, the great "white coal" that use does not exhaust.

I have only touched on that great North Land with its unlimited resources, but I have told you a little about its wealth in timber, about its agricultural possibilities, about its minerals and about its abundance of cheap power. What does it mean when all these materials and power are utilized? Does it not mean that the North is destined in the future to become one of the greatest manufacturing centres of the whole North American Continent? When the resources of that country are developed as they will be, undoubtedly, it will no longer be sparsely settled, but a hub of industry. The "backbone," as that section of country between North Bay and Winnipeg has been called, will no longer be a great barrier between the East and the West, but in railway tonnage, if not in population itself, it will outstrip both East and West, helping to bind the great East and the greater West.

Some progress has already been made towards the development of that country and its resources. Look at the many industries already established in Northern Ontario. There are pulp and paper mills now at the Sault, at Espanola and Sturgeon Falls; one nearly completed at Dryden; one under construction at Fort Frances, and arrangements are completed for one at Iroquois Falls. There are smelters, concentrators, mills and mining plants of different kinds at Port Arthur, the Sault, Sudbury, Comiston, Cobalt, Porcupine and Midland. Consider the benefits of these plants at the Sault and Sudbury, for instance, to the province as a whole. Take the Lake Superior Corporation, one of the heads of which I am pleased to see sitting beside me. With its pulp, paper and steel industries, to-day it is employing an army of ten thousand men, paying in wages more than \$6,000,000 a year. The Sudbury mines and mining plants employ thousands, and their payrolls run into the millions. What does that mean not only to the Sault and Sudbury but to the whole Province of Ontario? It surely means that the province at large must be benefited by these industries. In other words, it means a splendid consuming market for the farmer and manufacturer alike, building up the whole agricultural life of this country. What is true of the plants at Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie

is true in a greater or less extent of the plants at Espanola and Sturgeon Falls, Dryden and elsewhere, and will be true of other plants now under construction. These are some of the signs of development, and we hope to have in the near future industries stretching from one side to the other across that North land.

Let us now consider what has been done and what is now doing in the matter of railroad construction in that country, a most important factor in the development of any country. The only railway we had there until recently was the Canadian Pacific, and when it was built the resources of the North country were not thought of. What the Canadian Pacific was seeking was the location of a through line of railway from East to West, in the place where construction was easiest and cheapest, without regard to the development of the country through which it passed. This line consequently follows practically the height of land between Lakes Huron and Superior and Hudson Bay, the most barren and God-forsaken country in that whole North land. What timber there was in that territory was burnt off long ago, and except for what minerals there may be there, that part of the country is totally unproductive. But only a few miles to the South are the fertile and well-timbered valleys of splendid rivers flowing into Lake Superior; while thirty or forty miles to the North is the Clay Belt, watered with other splendid streams flowing into Hudson Bay. Now we are getting additional railways to develop these lands and open them up. Besides the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway, which runs through that country 253 miles from North Bay to Cochrane, there are the Canadian Pacific Railway just spoken of, running 1,000 miles through Northern Ontario; the National Transcontinental, for 761 miles through the Clay Belt; the Canadian Northern, which for over a thousand miles—1,043 is the exact mileage, will traverse the Southerly portion of the Clay Belt; the Algoma Central, from the Sault to the Transcontinental, 300 miles; the Michipicoten Branch, 36 miles; and the Algoma Eastern, from Little Current to Sudbury, 60 miles; making a total of 3,453 miles constructed and under construction. Who can estimate the great impetus all these lines will give to the development of that country when all are in operation and directly interested in the building up of the country through which they run?

Already we have done considerable in the settlement of this country. Five years ago there were, I am told, not more than five thousand people in Temiskaming; to-day there are

70,000 to 80,000. Many of these no doubt are engaged in mining, but during the present year at four Crown Land Agencies in the Temiskaming region, at Cochrane, New Liskeard, Matheson and Englehart, the agents have sold 212,000 acres of land, settling on them over 1,300 settlers,—1,372 is the exact figures, a creditable showing up to date for the present year. Think what may be the possibilities in the future of that country when all the agencies I have referred to are at work in different ways and all vitally interested in helping to develop and bring that land to the position Providence intended it should occupy.

As to the fertility and productiveness of the agricultural sections of that country, no one here, I think, has any doubt whatever. Some of you have seen the magnificent farm exhibit in the car that has been travelling about the country. All of you have heard statements made from time to time on this subject by responsible men, who have personally investigated the facts, and you have seen a little in visits you have taken, but its productiveness is beyond all question or doubt. Permit me to refer you on this subject to Mr. J. F. Whitson, who has been placed in charge of the opening up of roads through the North; and as he is not a politician he will not exaggerate, (laughter) but I know he will tell you a wonderful story of that country and its fertility. He will tell you he can pick out county after county as large as any in Old Ontario and without practically an acre of waste land. I have one explanation to make in that connection. At one meeting I made a statement that Mr. Whitson had told me about one man, seventy or eighty years of age, who had cleared and prepared for cultivation a farm up there; and after the meeting I overheard one man say, "Well, of all the cheerful liars I ever heard, that man Hearst beats them all. I could stand all he told us about the North, until he told us about all the acres that that old man cleared, and nobody could stand for that." So I have not repeated that story. (Laughter.)

You have sometimes heard that country spoken of as the Great North Land and this may have given you the idea that it was a place of almost perpetual cold. Nothing could be further from the fact. Cochrane lies south of Winnipeg, and much of what we call Northern Ontario lies south of the International boundary in the West. Mr. Whitson can tell you of the beautiful weather they are having in the country around Cochrane now. When coming down he found snow and cold only when he came to North Bay. He knew nothing

of it in the North where they were enjoying summer weather in the great banana belt. (Laughter.) That country is capable of producing all kinds of vegetables, and grain crops of all kinds. It is a land of wonderful richness. Clover grows luxuriantly, and the growing and marketing of clover and of timothy seed is fast becoming a great industry. The North will soon be the great source of supply of seeds of almost all kinds. As a fodder country it is unsurpassed, and it possesses everything to make it an ideal stock raising country. But spring and fall wheat, oats, barley and cereals of all kinds too are being largely cultivated. Oats falling from a horse's feed box this year grew to a height of 6 feet, 3 inches, with well-filled heads, while potato peelings, planted in July, developed into splendid tubers before the end of September. In Algoma there are as fine and as well-developed farms as in the County of York, producing crops of all kinds. St. Joseph's Island is peculiarly adapted for fruit raising and dairying. Strawberries grown in Algoma and sold in Winnipeg netted 10 cents per box to the producer.

I have here some potatoes grown 380 miles north of Port Arthur in the District of Patricia; they were harvested a little early or they would have been fine specimens; they were brought in by Mr. Tyrrell on his return trip from Port Nelson. He only paid \$1 a bushel for them. I sometimes wish I was living in Patricia instead of in the City of Toronto, when I see the bills for produce come in.

The Toronto Board of Trade, which has always taken a great interest in the North country, prepared a splendid report on it not long ago, in which a statistician says that the purchasing power of the territory from North Bay to Cochrane amounts to \$45,599,320 a year. So it is something to the manufacturers and the merchants of Toronto to help open up and develop that country.

Now, in conclusion, let me say that the Dominion of Canada has splendid assets from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Providence has rarely blessed any people with such opportunities and such resources as we possess. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have their splendid orchards, their timber, their fisheries, their coal and their iron. Quebec has her mighty St. Lawrence with her ever-expanding commerce and her agriculture. British Columbia has her fisheries, her fruit, her minerals, her scenery, and her timber. Alberta has her flocks and herds, her gas and coal. Saskatchewan and Manitoba have their millions of bushels of golden grain. But the old Banner Province of Ontario is the peer and the flower of

them all. It is splendidly located among the Provinces of the Dominion, combining in full measure the resources of them all, (except coal, and that is compensated for by the abundance of hydraulic power I have spoken of) and having for its greatest asset a splendid, well-nurtured, well-educated, God-fearing people, I believe, unsurpassed in any country on God's green earth!

The Province of Ontario must not only be the keystone of Confederation geographically and commercially, but intellectually as well. Thousands of people are pouring yearly into our land, foreigners from continental Europe and everywhere, many of them knowing nothing of free institutions or responsible Government. What duty does that bring to us? The duty of Canadians is to preach the gospel of free British institutions to these foreigners who come to our shores to make their homes here, so that this fair Dominion of ours may continue to have a splendid, free, and enlightened people, to make secure the intellectual and moral supremacy she enjoys to-day.

Look upon our assets; there are illimitable waterways to purify our physical life, to float 10,000 ships and to make us commercially great as the freedom of the seas made Great Britain great. There is electricity to light and heat our homes, to furnish transportation and turn the wheels of commerce. There is the priceless asset of scenery and the recreation grounds of the world; with an invigorating climate and a clear blue sky to breed men of dominance and power; with a foundation of population comprising the best blood of the Anglo-Saxon and allied races. But these splendid assets, and our unique situation bring both opportunity and responsibility; and to the citizens of Ontario is given a great duty, a splendid opportunity to work together for the development of the great resources to which I have referred, and make this Banner Province a vital force in the Dominion, cementing East to West, so that in the years to come we will know neither East nor West, North nor South, but a united Canada pulsating with intellectual and commercial vigor and force from the Atlantic to the Pacific, making our blest land of the maple not only a source of strength to but a dominating influence in that Empire that encircles the globe. I thank you.

(November 27th, 1912.)

Our Present Duty Towards Toronto's Future.

BY MR. R. HOME SMITH.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club on the 27th November, Mr. R. Home Smith said:

Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen,—I had intended beginning my remarks in the conventional manner, by paying a few graceful references to the Canadian Club and to the kind introduction of the President, but when I came to consider the matter this morning, I found that I was distinctly nervous, and so I went over my remarks that I propose to give. I read them over twice: the first time I found that it took me ten minutes, but the second time it took me an hour and a half. (Laughter.) If it takes me only ten minutes I will try to be as graceful in my finale as the President, but if it takes me an hour and a half there won't be anybody here to care how I finish.

I know of no more engrossing topic than Toronto's future. It is engrossing because to a certain extent it is indefinite. Before we can determine what our duty is, and each and every one of us has a duty, we must have some clear conception in the minds of all of us as to what that future is. Now it is one of the signs of the times in this city that everybody is now satisfied that Toronto has a future. We forget that there was a time when the majority of the citizens were not satisfied that Toronto had any future whatever. For twenty years we had been living in the shadow of the boom and the collapse of years ago. I think the majority of the business men during that time thought that Toronto had come up on a wave, and that the wave had receded, never to come up to high water mark again. Only within the last three years has there been absolute unanimity of opinion that Toronto has a great future.

* Mr. R. Home Smith is a young Canadian financier who is not afraid of heavy undertakings either on his own account or on behalf of the community. As a forceful member of the Harbor Commission, he has served Toronto effectively, and it may be hoped that he will yet enter the City Council.

But that unanimity of opinion is not sufficient: we must have something more: we must have a clear idea of what type of city Toronto is to be. We have here wealth; we have population. We shall have a million people in this city inside of fifteen years. We shall quadruple and quintuple our wealth. That means we may become a large city, rich and populous, like Birmingham or Pittsburgh.

That future is not entrancing to me. Surely there is something better than population. I want to place before you what my ideal is. It may be a ridiculous ideal; it may be just a dream and a vision and you will laugh it away. But if we take ourselves seriously there is a chance that our future will develop along large lines; if we do not, it will surely develop along narrow lines.

I am absolutely certain this city has a great future before it. It was only a few years ago when no one dreamed that this could be true; when men doubted of the future of this city; as there were men who doubted of the future of the British Empire; they thought that Empire had reached its zenith and was on the decline. Now there is none who does not believe that the British Empire is destined to be greater yet in magnitude and in influence. It may be very soon that this will be fully realized. There is a new idea of the British Empire, not perhaps the general idea, or one yet meeting general acceptance, but one which sees the dominant mother country and the colonies closely linked together in one great Empire. There is another idea of the British Empire that appeals to me, where each part of that British Empire will secure the place which it is entitled to by reason of its wealth, its population, its intellectual standing and power; and I firmly believe, gentlemen, that the dominant partner in the British Empire will eventually be the Dominion of Canada.

Now, gentlemen, if that is so, what is to be Toronto's future? As I say, it may be a vision, it may be foolish, but I believe Toronto is to become the dominant city in the dominant partner in the Empire, and to be a great city as judged by world's standards. (Applause.)

Now, we have a beginning of that to-day. Toronto is a great city in education, as a place of residence, in sports, and in music, and in these matters we judge what we do by world standards. It is not enough that we want to do the best in Ontario, we have to take high standards, and say to each one in every activity that he must be judged by world standards. Now as for the University and music, and other activities,

they are in good hands and will be well taken care of. But we the citizens at large have the duty of providing for Toronto the site for a great city,—we haven't it to-day. We must have a system of local parks and playgrounds, to take the children off the streets, and to provide local breathing centres. We must have a great park system, and a great boulevard system, and it will not take Toronto more than ten years to secure these improvements. (Applause.) Now, gentlemen, applause won't do; talking won't do. Some of us, I think, who are in this room, have been agitating for years for these improvements. It is up to us to do it now, because the time will soon be gone when we can act.

There is property such as the Garrison Creek ravine and the Don Valley that could have been acquired a short time ago at small cost, but to-day you can't get it; if we had acquired these lands they would have been to-day a part of an inside system of boulevards, for the city has since extended far beyond that property, and now we are as it were thrown on our second line of entrenchments. There is land to be had now for an outside boulevard system: we should have it, and we must have it! (Applause.)

We must have it for more than one reason. It is a mistake to look upon parks as only for recreation. A great park system can be evolved by combining the best architectural genius and the best landscape artists' skill, a great inspiration, which will aid every man, woman and child to attain high ideals and a nobler life. Another reason is, that if we are to be a great world city, appealing to every man of international standing, we must have such a city that no tourist who comes to this continent can afford to pass; he must be compelled to come to Toronto. And the one thing that will attract tourists will be a great park system.

Up to two years ago the outlook was hopeless. We had talked much, but done little. Now you have the Harbor Commissioners' plans. (Applause.) We debated a great deal as to whether they should include a park system or should concern themselves only with the commercial and industrial area. We came to the conclusion that the people of Toronto had put the matter in our hands in order to arrive at a complete solution of the problem, not a patchwork scheme, but one to include the whole water front. The citizens and the press have taken this to heart, and we have begun, and have not only the plans, but if our financial program is accepted, for it is going to be largely a problem of financing, I believe that within ten years we shall have in

actual use one of the most magnificent water fronts on the continent of America. (Applause.)

Now, gentlemen, we have done more than that. You have another addition to the park area and this water front boulevard scheme. Partly by accident, partly by design, and partly by the exercise of a good deal of patience, we have a park boulevard practically completed on the western limits of the city. So that the western end of the city is looked after. And the city of Toronto is committed to the program of the water front improvement. Now all that is required is that we provide an eastern boulevard. The eastern part of the city has been neglected in this respect. It is time to acquire a system of parks and boulevards also in the north end of the city, thus connecting the two sides.

Just one other point I should like to mention in that connection. This generation cannot allow Scarboro' Cliffs to remain in private ownership. That must be taken up and dealt with. (Applause.)

We can if we will settle one of the requisites in the site of a world city, for if our park system is completed on the lines outlined, it will compare with anything in the world. But what makes me at times almost frantic, is this sending men to other countries to see things, who come back and say, not "We will do as well as the best," but "What will just suffice for this city." We have the opportunity for making a great park system, and all we have to do is to take it.

The next thing we need is a proper system of street communication. The rectangular plan is the one on which Toronto is laid out, and this plan we have to change. We hear that the city of Paris is spending a hundred millions on street widening. We have made some progress in this direction, in the widening of Bloor Street, Danforth Avenue, and St. Clair Avenue. And there has been the agitation to widen Yonge Street, and Teraulay Street, and to put through Victoria Street. We have to do more than that. And it is a difficult problem of finance. But we have to solve the problem of street intercommunication. One practical solution, in the large sense, is by diagonal streets.

There seems to be in Toronto a tradition that everything has to go north and south; but the fact remains that this city has grown each and west: it stretches for twelve miles along the water front. Yet every time you have to go down town you must follow two sides of a triangle. I should like to have some statistician figure up what is the loss in dis-

tance to the people of this city by going along the two sides of the triangle instead of on the one side, the straight line. That is the reason for the congestion on Yonge Street. Every butcher's boy—I suppose he is the worst offender in traffic, (Laughter) who has to come down town from the northwest part of the city—does he come down Spadina Avenue or some other street west of Yonge? No! he pikes east to Yonge Street, and comes down Yonge.

Now, gentlemen, wide Yonge Street; widen Teraulay Street; but surely the best way to relieve Yonge Street, is to take a large part of its traffic off, and bring it down as the crow flies, bring the east and west traffic down by diagonal streets. (Applause.) You can't widen all the streets to relieve the congestion, but you can build diagonal ones. And I make this statement—and I have spent weeks and weeks and weeks upon the study of this problem, if not "months and months and months" (laughter)—going into it very thoroughly: you can build diagonal streets as a business proposition and make money on them. I stake my reputation on that, because I have gone into it, I have drawn plans, I have got the names of the owners and the assessment, and I say you can make a profit after deducting the cost of the construction and the value of the property taken, by the sale of the frontages on the new thoroughfares at the enhanced prices that they will command. That is the second point in the question of site, you must improve the street intercommunication, as well as provide a system of parks.

And the third necessity is a proper railway system both of steam and electric service, one that will compare favorably with those of other cities on this continent. You remember, years ago, when the Toronto Railway wanted loops down town, we nearly all opposed them, but they have gone on and they have done better by reason of them. Probably, if not altogether, our traction difficulties have come from absence of plan. It is much easier to get good results when everything is correlated and corresponds to some plan. It is time we had a plan for our steam railways with common entrances, and that we secured the very best possible entrances for radial and local electrics so they can reach the centre of the city. You will never have a great city as long as you have merely chance location of railway entrances and routes. No doubt the future of Toronto that appeals to everybody is that of a city of homes. If your city had only two or three hundred thousand people a number could walk to their homes; but if Toronto is to be a city of homes, when

it is a city of a million, you must have far-flung suburbs, that can be quickly, cheaply, and comfortably reached by steam or electric railways.

I want you to have patience with me, as I am going to propose a solution. It may be all wrong; at any rate it will be called all wrong. The program I have outlined has nothing new in it: it has been discussed before. I understand that a program of that kind is called "getting big eyes." I don't like the term: there is a suggestion of amazement, of wonderment, perhaps of hysteria. I'd rather get a clear eye. What is wanted is a calm, clear, deliberate eye, to see and plan for the future. And what we do want more than big eyes are big, lusty arms to carry out our plans. We have barely made a start. In two or three years it will be too late, the city's destiny will be fixed. Are you going to have a Birmingham or a Pittsburgh here? It is no laughing matter: I am forestalling perhaps some mirth over this prospect: You can have a city the equal of London or Paris in world-wide influence, right here on the shores of Lake Ontario in the city of Toronto.

Now, gentlemen, what I have to propose with reference to these matters—is this: I do not believe that the constitution of the City Council, under the present arrangement and legislation, is going to carry out a program such as I have indicated. I am not referring to the personnel of the Council, but to the structure of it. I don't believe that structure will allow of our creating a really great city of Toronto.

At the same time, I don't believe—this is only my personal opinion,—I don't believe in Commission Government. You may make any changes you like, by cutting down the membership of the Council, or by election by the whole city instead of by wards. But one thing I think is necessary: you should strengthen the heads of Departments; and pay them decent salaries! (Applause.) You can't get men to run a big city on five, six, or seven thousand dollars a year. I say that any man at the head of a Department who is not worth \$12,000 a year is not worth being at the head of the job!

And in addition to that I would make two Commissions. Perhaps you may think that is because I am on the Harbor Commission! But one thing is sure—I am not hoping to be on any other: it means hard work, and a great deal of time, so I will let somebody else have the honor of being on these others, that I propose. I would appoint two Commissions: one, which I understand is already on the books of the

Council, a Civic Utilities Commission, to manage the water-works, the street railways, the Hydro-Electric, and every other civic business. We have tried to do it through the City Council, but we can't do it. And I would, secondly, suggest a strong Civic Improvement Commission. We have one Commission already, but it is only a Commission for planning. And we have lost interest in planning. I think the work of the Harbor Commission has appealed to the people, not by reason of the plan that it has put before the citizens—the plan of itself would have fallen flat—but by reason of the substantial assets in the hands of the Commission, and its financial powers, which will quickly carry the plan into effect. Action is the only way to interest the public. My proposed plan would be only waste paper unless there were given to Commissions power to carry them into effect.

I would appoint a Civic Improvement Commission, and I would say, that the most important thing is the personnel of such a Commission. I would give that Commission power, to plan a great park system, to take the plans as we have them to-day, and to lay out new plans for a system of boulevards.

In the same way this Commission would plan the widening of old streets, and the construction of new streets. I have touched on this point already, but I am talking of permanent street widening and construction, with power to finance. I would give the Commission power to plan steam and radial entrances and terminals. Power to purchase lands necessary for improvements should further be given it, and to purchase lands abutting on these improvements for resale at a profit.

I would give the Commissioners power to issue their own debentures as securities for the improvements. And I would set apart from $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ a mill on the dollar as a revenue for that Commission. Now that would amount on this year's assessment to \$38,000, and on this revenue the Commission could raise at least the sum of \$2,000,000 next year, to start that work of purchase. Until we put our hands right down into our pockets,—for the future of Toronto and are prepared for some self-sacrifice, we are not in earnest.

I would give that Commission ample financial powers to carry out its work, and in addition to that, gentlemen,—it may not be a popular matter, but I would seriously consider placing in the hands of the Commission the establishment of a small increment tax for revenue. Our means of revenue are nearly exhausted, and it is time we considered an incre-

ment tax of 5 or 10 per cent., to be allocated for capital expenditure and for that alone. I know with a great many men such a proposal is not popular. Every dollar I have in the world is in real estate, and if that idea should be enforced I would be heavily taxed. But if I had to pay an increment tax of \$200,000, I should be well able to do it, because if that were ten per cent. I should have made \$2,000,000, and \$200,000 would be little enough for me to pay into the civic treasury. And if that money went into parks and boulevards, I would be more willing to pay it. I think most men would rather put money into expenditure for such visible improvements than into an intake pipe outside the island which you never see unless it floats (laughter), or into underground sewers or water pipes.

I believe we should take up this matter of an increment tax. We have to get new means of revenue. We have to sacrifice. Real estate owners will get the benefit. We will accept an increment tax as long as the people see that it is earmarked for capital expenditure on improvements.

It may be that this work of improvement can be worked out by the City Council. But it seems to me that new machinery is needed to work out a plan that is extraordinary. If Toronto is to have an ordinary future, then ordinary machinery will do; but if, on the contrary, we have a future before us which demands extraordinary machinery, we should take extraordinary means to see that the plan is properly carried out.

Now, gentlemen,—it may be you wonder what I am coming at; it may be I have not been very clear. Sometimes the more keenly a man feels on a subject, the harder it is to explain himself on it.

Even if a city has paltry wealth and squalid surroundings, it is already great if it has a great spirit, noble aspirations, and high courage to accomplish them. That is the touchstone. Toronto has sufficient wealth and population to be a great city, if we will simply make up our minds that the destiny of the city of Toronto is a great one, and that we intend to be worthy of it!" (Applause.)

(December 2nd, 1912.)

The Relation of Business and Professional Men to Moral and Religious Institutions.

BY MR. FRED. B. SMITH.*

AT a regular meeting of the Canadian Club on the 2nd December, 1912, Mr. Fred. B. Smith said:

Dr. Colquhoun, the Bishop of Toronto, and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,—After having had the privilege at the hands of the Secretary of this Club of seeing the list of topics which have been discussed for two years past, and having been informed of the distinguished gentlemen that have had the honor of addressing this Club in this present current year, I want the first remark I make to inform the members of the Canadian Club of Toronto that my appreciation of myself was never so great as it is at this moment. I certainly feel that the day must be rapidly approaching when I shall get some title. (Laughter.) As an earnest of that I notice that the Canadian Club has distinguished me already by adding one syllable to my name in the notices that have appeared of this luncheon, and I am from this time "Frederick," and I am not "Fred." simply, as I have been known hitherto. (Laughter.)

I wish in the second place to say that it affords me great satisfaction to congratulate the Canadian Club of Toronto upon its work and its very wide influence. Personally, I believe every city on this North American Continent should have an open forum of this character, where any topic in any way worthy of consideration can be thrown into the hopper for discussion upon its merits. I am glad to have had the privilege of meeting Canadian Clubs all the way from St. John to as far west as Vancouver.

When I received the invitation from your Secretary, at first I complimented myself upon it, but of course, not being willing to travel under false colors I wrote to the Secretary saying that I thought he must have made a mistake, that he had not seriously intended to invite me, but must have meant

* Mr. Fred B. Smith of New York is the Religious Work Secretary of the International Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association.

to write to someone else. He came back, however, with a more earnest letter, saying it was certainly me that he intended to invite.

You will sympathize in a way with my embarrassment. I am a religionist, and have been for a quarter of a century; I am not so familiar with things that are not related to religion. Two things embarrass me. I do not know what you expect of me. All the friends I have in Toronto have said to me something they think I ought to talk about, and I have letters from friends in New York, too, who suggest things they think I ought to say. You can imagine how distressing a thing it is for a man whose friends advise him, each one in a different way, and after one has had a week of that you know how well he is prepared to speak. (Laughter.)

I find myself in something of the difficulty that I was in when I went into a church club banquet in Chicago. As I was hurrying through the lobby of the Y.M.C.A., where the banquet was being given, one of the Secretaries said, "Before you go up to speak at the banquet you must come in and talk five minutes before our street boys' sociable." They had five hundred newsboys there that night. If any of you have ever faced a crowd like that you know what that means. I am not much afraid of you men: I can fool you anyway, (laughter)—but you can't fool an equal number of newsboys. Up on the front seat there was a little Hebrew boy, with his head on the back of the seat, ready for a nap. I said, "I don't know what kind of a meeting you are having here, or what you expect me to do. Shall I make a speech, or offer prayer?" The Hebrew lad, apparently realizing the possibility of one thing or the other happening, shouted, "Make a speech!" I started in as best I could to make a speech. In five minutes I realized that I was not getting anywhere. Then there came that very ominous shuffling of feet, at the back of the room: the boys were getting restless. I paused to think of something more to say and just then this same Hebrew lad shouted yet louder, "Let us pray!" (Laughter.) He had heard me try a speech, and knew I couldn't do that, and he was willing to have prayer and go out.

Now I am just about that much confused about the Canadian Club to-day. I really do not know whether you expect me to make a speech, offer prayer, or try to sing a hymn. Therefore I am confused.

Then I am a little bit confused again, because if I start really and seriously,—I know the limitations of time of this

Club, and I shall observe them, but I know it will be difficult. I am reminded of an engineer I met in South Africa—and I anticipate this little incident by saying that for fourteen years I have traveled more than fifty thousand miles a year, most of that in North America, and I am very glad to pose as an illustration of what the railroads of this continent can do for a man, for I have never been in a car with a wheel off the track. But I traveled some time in South Africa three years ago. I went on that fast cannon-ball flier from Bloemfontein to Kimberley. It went eight miles *per*! (Laughter.) Suddenly I felt a bumping sensation. I reached for my camera and ran out to get a picture of the wreck. There was the engine, a little bit of a thing, on its nose in the ditch, and the engineer, who as he stood there seemed to tower over it, told me he had been twenty-two years on the road and this was the first accident of the kind he had had. On examining the track I found that the engine had jumped of the track and had bumped along for a hundred yards to find a ditch to run off into. The road where it left the rails was all level. I said to the engineer, "Why didn't you stop there where you first ran off the rails, instead of coming along here to this ditch?" I cannot forget the look of that great Scotchman as he answered, "Captain, I didn't have up steam enough to stop!" (Laughter.) I would like to have Dr. Colquhoun know that it is one thing to invite a man from the other side of the line, and give him the one opportunity of a lifetime to speak before this Club, and it is another to expect him to do it in thirty minutes or less!

There are only two or three things I can announce in connection with this topic, which is so splendidly announced on the card that it puts me at ease at once. I am asked to speak on the subject of "The Relation of Business and Professional Men to Moral and Religious Institutions." I have no doubt whatever that some of the members of the Canadian Club when they received that card had a strange sensation come over them. After having had such discussions as the "Future of Toronto," and the "Significance of the War of 1812," and the opening up of your great "Empire of the Northwest," when they received the notice that a man was to speak on "The Relation of Business and Professional Men to Moral and Religious Institutions," in the minds of some men it would sound an anticlimax. When some man of the Canadian Club saw that notice, I am sure he exclaimed, "Oh mush! What has happened to the Canadian Club anyway? Have they suddenly gotten sick, and are going to die? What ever

led them to interject a topic like that?" Some men have that impression of a subject of this character.

The Canadian Club in the past has had great discussions and in the future it will have great discussions, but this one thing I do know: this topic, is absolutely the greatest one you will ever bring into this forum. There is no topic ever brought to the attention of the men of this Canadian Club, vaster or more profound than the theme of religion. Gentlemen, you may search in the realms of politics, society, and Commerce but everywhere you will strike this problem of religion before you settle these other problems. Therefore, whether I am equal to my theme or not, I am sure the theme is worthy of the Canadian Club. I have no apology to offer for bringing it to you.

There are four reasons why I think business and professional men should have a relation to moral and religious institutions. And I think I may help you to see clearly these reasons by stating that I am not here to promote any organization. As the sleight-of-hand man says, "I have no cards up my sleeve." I do not seek here the interests of any organization or any denomination. If a man is a Methodist, what I will say may, I hope, stimulate him to think whether or not he should seek to be a better Methodist. If a Baptist, to be a more intense Baptist. If an Anglican, whether or not he should take a little deeper hold of these great problems in his church. If a Catholic, whether he should not have intensified loyalty to the church of his belief. I am not here to advocate any special form of religion.

One of the most classic men America ever produced—Sam Jones,—I don't know whether he was ever in this country or not. ("He was.") Well, Sam Jones used to say: "It is written, 'Birds of a feather flock together.' If there is a bird with only 'a' feather, I think it ought to flock with somebody!" Now in the religious realm there are men with just "a" feather. I do not hope to influence that man much.

Have you heard the definition of a "level-headed man?" We are always complimenting certain men by saying they are "level-headed." I saw the definition the other day. The level-headed man is the man who agrees with me! (Laughter.) Sure! Now, I am not here to say you ought to be religious just exactly as I am. But I do say that every member of the Canadian Club ought to have a powerful grip upon this question of religion.

And I say this for four reasons. First of all, *You need it yourselves.* I don't care here to sound any pessimistic

note. It is not in my heart to do so. But this North American land of ours has been pretty well scandalized in the last ten years by men high in position who have broken down in morals,—men holding positions of great trust and power but over whom the temptations have been too severe and they have gone down. I am an American! As intense as any that ever lived! But if it would do any good, I could sound words of repentance for men who have broken down. You in Canada have your share! I need, therefore, to emphasize first your own personal need of religion. The man who is the drunkest man on the streets of Toronto is the man who is so drunk he thinks that the sober men are drunk and that he alone is sober. The man that needs religion most is the man who doesn't realize his need at all. If you are going to hold yourselves in moral security during the next twenty years, you personally need the vital touch of things religious!

There are no more profound things than that. I am not here to discuss personal moral security, but to press on business and professional men the need of vital contact with things religious.

In the second place, *Because in that realm men become really great.* In this land of North America, a land of knowledge and of unparalleled opportunity, there is a possibility of prospering after the measure of commerce and dying really poor, in those things that really spell greatness. I have read of a man who was "born a man and died a grocer." That could be well written as the biography of a good many men. Men are seeking everywhere for honors, for greatness. No man in this room is ever going to have an opportunity to get greatness in the forum of military achievement, or win laurels there,—certainly I hope not. Neither will any of you win great trophies by simply amassing a fortune and turning everything into money. That thing has become almost vulgar. We have some men in our country who have amassed immense wealth—I hope and pray to God we may never see another group as rich as they are! If a man again makes as much as some men in North America have made,—one thing is certain, he will be ashamed to tell it, it will not be known. The coming greatness men are going to win for themselves is going to be the greatness that comes in the realm of religion and service to mankind!

There are some great problems coming into the arena for solution.—New problems. I may not hope to mention them all but some are indicative. There is the problem of a fair, square chance for every man in the world to at least

have a fair right to live and to live in comfort. And I want to say, gentlemen, this problem, before we get through with it, is going to revolutionize life. There will have to be new methods in commerce, and a new note in politics. I believe, somewhere, there is going to be a real Christian civilization—not simply in name—but you know we are a long way from that yet. But I believe that eventually we are going to have one. Before that day fully dawns we have to drive that thing we talk about as the legalized rum traffic out of the land! It has to go. You can't keep that thing as a legalized business and hope for a perfect Christian civilization. There is the white slave traffic. It has more ramifications than merely the hunting down of the man who seduces and betrays a single life. If you trace it to its source, it will startle you. The white slave traffic has to be rooted out! And with it we must deal with that related question of divorce. I am glad that at the table here to-day there is seated the Bishop of Toronto as one of your guests, a Bishop of that church that does not have the least loophole in it for divorce! (Applause.)

I shall not attempt to name here the method by which we are to solve these problems, or advocate any organization for that purpose, but the men who are going to be used in solving every one of these vast problems are those who live by great religious emotions. I have watched men come on the map,—sort of skin-deep reformers, who promised to solve these problems by non-religious methods,—they have fallen by the way. The man who stays in the fight is the one who is in it because he believes God has called him there. Religion makes men really great, and therefore I plead for every member of this Club to have a definite relation to some such organization or movement.

I believe that business and professional men should have a relation to moral and religious institutions. In the third place, *Because this is the only true basis of real, up-to-date patriotism.* There is a good deal of bombastic talk about patriotism and some of it is mighty cheap. Some of it you have. I am an American;—of course I needn't tell you that, for the accent of my voice tells you that;—but an American with such blood as I have has a right to talk about patriotism, even under the Union Jack! I am reminded that my father's family came from Plymouth, and many of them, in the Church of England. My mother's family had their nesting place at Peebles, in Scotland. So I guess I have a right to talk about patriotism, even in this room. (Applause.)

You have ample cause to raise your heads high. You have been great once in war. You have had your Wellingtons and Nelsons and your little Lord Roberts; and yet you are not going to have another opportunity on that line in the future. You were once patriotic along that line, but now will have to find other ways. The British Empire will for ever be the greatest nation in colonization. For that nation I have the greatest admiration because of its achievements in colonization. I have seen India. Do not let any carping pessimists whine to you about the presence of the Union Jack in India! Those men who have known the deepest life in India testify that that flag has been a blessing to India. I have met the greatest Dutchmen in South Africa, and while they deplore the things that have happened there during the last few years, men like General Botha have said to me, "Did you ever see anything like it? Inside of ninety days after the war was over the British Government called a general election and said to the defeated people, 'Come in and help govern this country.'" No other colonizing nation would have done that so quickly after a war. Most conquering powers would have held back those foreigners ten years before giving them the franchise. Please do not think I am so innocent as to think that there are not some things that the British Empire needs to repent of. Oh, there are some bruises back there only eternity can heal! I know it! So do you. But these are only incidents: they are not the fundamental principle. But from the hour when that great Queen Victoria came into the scenes of earth, I believe the trend of the essential principle of the British Empire has been for God and humanity.

But where is the British Empire to be great in the coming years? In territory? No. That is great already. The British Empire must be great now as never before in religion,—to make good the pledges of these wars of the past that they have been for God and the Bible. That is not yet proven, the world at large does not believe it yet. The nation that can influence the world religiously as no other nation is this Dominion of Canada. Why? There are no nations jealous of you; no nations have grievances against Canada. Any method that has been worked out in Canada is acceptable all over the world. When I go on these tours in the interests of religious work, I point for examples to Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg. Things done there are acceptable everywhere, while I have learned that if I refer to Detroit, Cleveland, New York City, and Chicago, they say, "Aha! Look out! Something doing!" (Laughter.)

You great Canadians! I wish I could sound out a note to help you see the opportunity Canada has of being really great, the opportunity to be the most marvellous nation in all the world in things vitally religious.

In the fourth place, *Because it is the only honorable life.* Now I come to the fourth reason, and my final one, why I believe every member of the Canadian Club does himself honor to give this relation to moral and religious institutions a large place, and why I believe the Canadian Club has done itself honor in this forum to give this problem at least one distinct place on its program. I have said that one reason is because every man needs it for himself; the second reason is that it is an essential element of true greatness; the third, that it is a fundamental element of patriotism. And last of all, I believe it because no man in this room can spell "Honor" with a capital letter if he is an irreligious man. Now you just think that over for a while. No man in this room can spell "Honor" with a capital letter if he is an irreligious man. I wish sometimes that I could, for Canada as for my own country, get men to know their own history. I often wonder whether some men have read their own history. I wonder if you gentlemen of the Canadian Club know Canadian history; whether you are familiar with that scene down the river when those folks came to this country and they blessed God that they had come, and then kissed the ground. Bourinot, the historian, says at one place in his history, that the church was established in this land first, then the State; and if you know history here in Canada and believe in it, you should be religious men, for everything you have and will have, you owe to the influence of the church.

On a ship going from Calcutta to Rangoon I met a fine-looking gentlemen, who came up to me and said, "You are Mr. Smith?" I didn't warm up. "I saw your picture in the paper, and heard you speaking." I still held myself with wonderful dignity. "I find that you and I have drawn seats together in the dining saloon." I now saw that of necessity we should have to form a close acquaintance. Finally he reached for me the third time, and got me. "I am greatly interested," said he, "in Baptist missions in Burma!" I thought, "Here's a member of my lodge! We must be friends." (Laughter.) He told me he had underwritten missionaries in Burma, away up beyond the tinkling bells of Mandalay! That night I went into the smoking room of the ship—just to look around and see what the other men were doing. (Laughter.) I don't see any humor in that!

(Laughter.) There was a game of poker on, the stakes were high, whisky and soda flowing like water. And my Baptist deacon in the centre of the ring! (Laughter.) I went out to walk the deck. It was a moonlight night, and presently my friend came out, and joined me. I said to him, "You will pardon me, Sir, but I was sorry to see you in that poker game." "Oh, I always do that on ship." "But is it not a strange thing for you to do?" I asked. "Why, I am a rich man, I can afford to lose," he replied. "But," I said, "what about using your influence in that way?" "Say," he said, "you have got me in wrong some way, haven't you?" I asked, "Aren't you a member of the Baptist Church?" "Oh, never! Not me! None of that stuff for me!" he exclaimed. Then, I said, "How about those missions over in Burma?" "Oh, this is the way," he answered. "You see, I am a lumberman, and I am cutting logs away up there, and unless those missionaries go ahead of us and tame the heathen, they will eat us up!" (Laughter.) You get my illustration, gentlemen. Here in this place away off in India there was a lumberman that wanted to saw logs and get his lumber out, and the first man he sent into that part of the country was the missionary.

I want you business men to look me in the eyes! Every dollar you have got in the world, you owe to religion! Take the Church out of Canada, and where would your business be? Let every man of you give a cheque for half his wealth to the Church, and you will still be in debt for the other half!

Religion is an essential thing in your life. You want to know who is the biggest man in this Club? Who is the biggest man in the City of Toronto to-day? I can describe him so you can locate him. He is the man who is doing most for religion.

As I part with you let me say this: I love the soil of my country as I love my life! But next to that I love my cousins in the Dominion of Canada. My prayer goes out to God now that a great religious force may be kindled in this world. We are going to sum up our lives faster than we think. We are going away from this, and it is going to come faster to many men here than they think. If you want to write yourself hard in life, if you want to write yourself deep in life, if you want to build memorials that will last, gentlemen, see that you have big wealth, a liberal part, in promoting religion! This is my message of this day.

(December 9th, 1912.)

Railway Development in Canada.

BY MR. A. S. GOODEVE.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club on the 9th December, Mr. A. S. Goodeve said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—The subject which I have chosen for my remarks this afternoon is "Railway Development in Canada,"—a subject in all countries intimately connected with their progress, but peculiarly so in the Dominion of Canada, because without it we could never have gathered together those scattered provinces, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, into one harmonious whole.

A factor which has an important bearing in deciding what amount of the progress of Canada is attributable to this railway development is the waterways of Canada. I suppose I am safe in saying that no country in the world is more blest with waterways capable of being developed for transportation than this northern portion of the North American Continent which we call Canada.

Perhaps I could better illustrate that to you by taking you in imagination on a trip across Canada. Starting at the mouth of the St. Lawrence we should pass up the Great Lakes, Ontario, Erie, Huron and Superior, to Port Arthur, a distance of 2,400 miles. There we would pass into the Kaministiquia River and up it for 150 miles. After that a short portage would bring us to Rainy River, up which we would proceed for 300 miles to Lake Winnipeg, across Lake Winnipeg 300 miles to the Saskatchewan; up the Saskatchewan we should go 1,500 miles, thence across the Rocky Mountains, and down the Thompson and Fraser Rivers 1,400 miles to the Pacific Ocean, whence in a few months' time, no doubt, we shall be able to take sail back through the Panama Canal to the point of starting.

But we should not have exhausted our possibilities of water trips with that journey. Did time permit, we could take a side trip up the Ottawa for 600 miles; or over the Atha-

* Mr. Arthur Samuel Goodeve is a member of the Dominion Railway Commission. He was formerly Mayor of Rossland, later Provincial Secretary in the McBride Government of British Columbia, later Provincial Forestry Commissioner, and later still (until 1912) he sat in the House of Commons for a British Columbia constituency.

baska and the Mackenzie, the latter of which is navigable for some 2,400 miles. Or should we desire to view some of the grandest mountain scenery to be found anywhere in the world, we might travel from Kootenay Landing, on the Crow's Nest Pass line, to Revelstoke, on the main line of the C.P.R., by way of the Kootenay Lake and the Columbia River and Arrow Lakes, a distance of 286 miles. Even now, we are not through, because every Province of this great Dominion has its lesser rivers and wondrous scenic lakes, such as your own beautiful lakes of Muskoka.

Now these waterways have had an important bearing on the construction of railways, because the first idea of the railway builders was that of supplementing these great waterways. The first railway charter granted in Canada was in 1832, in the reign of William IV, for a line from the St. Lawrence to Lake Champlain. The Champlain and St. Lawrence Railway charter was for 46 miles. The first 16 miles of that railway was not constructed till 1836, and it was only a road of wooden rails and horse traction. But after one winter they found the necessity of changing their methods, so they introduced iron rails and steam power. The road was completed in 1851, and so we had the first connection between New York and Montreal, thus connecting with the various lake ports throughout the district.

There was very little active railway construction from that time till 1850, but between 1850 and 1860 there was considerable. The Grand Trunk undertook to construct a railway from Riviere du Loup in the East to Sarnia in the west, a distance of 873 miles. The construction on the first section of that line, viz., from Montreal to Toronto or Hamilton, 373 miles, meant the uniting and giving a continuous through railway for 964 miles, because another line extended south from the lakes, and still another was being built from Portland to Montreal.

Some idea of what the building of this road meant may be gathered from the fact that while the construction of it was entrusted to one of the most celebrated English firms, which had had experience in England and on the Continent of Europe, yet those contractors lost \$5,000,000, and a million dollars loomed larger in the eyes of men then, than in these days of mergers and trusts. It cost \$13,320,000 to connect Montreal with the City of Toronto, and for years the construction of that railway was looked upon as the eighth wonder of the world.

Even at this time we were dependent largely upon water transportation, and it was made possible by the building of locks on the St. Lawrence, completed in 1848, and the Welland Canal, completed in 1829, so connecting with all the lake ports to the west and south.

In the Maritime Provinces they had recognized as early as 1832 the importance of railway connection with the rest of Canada. And in 1836-7 they undertook to survey a railway, towards the cost of which the Imperial Government gave £10,000. A portion of the road surveyed ran through territory under dispute with the United States, so that work was allowed to drag, no actual construction taking place. In 1842 by the Maine Boundary Award, the dispute was settled in favor of the United States, so that a new survey had to be undertaken.

However, there was a growing feeling that if the several Provinces of Canada were ever to succeed they must enter into a union. That feeling culminated in the Confederation Act. They drew up a resolution, which was adopted and afterwards crystallized into what is known as the British North America Act of 1867. The Maritime Provinces made it a condition of their entering the Confederation, in fact a *sine qua non*, that Canada should build a railway from the Maritime Provinces to Montreal. Thus began the Inter-colonial Railway. This railway was completed in 1876, thus forming the second period in Canadian Railway construction. Ex-Senator Albert J. Beveridge gives in the "Review of Reviews" for November, an interesting synopsis of that railway, and among other nice things he says with regard to it is that while it is longer than from New York to Kansas City, or than from New York to New Orleans, and while constructed for colonization purposes through a sparsely settled territory, whose products are chiefly agricultural and lumber, yet notwithstanding that fact, and all the criticisms against it, "it has not been a failure." He points out that the total cost, from the first survey, was \$92,000,000. That, he says, is less than the average cost of the average American railway. Further, he says that the roadbed, and the general conditions are superior to those of the average American railway. And he points out that the average freight rates, based on the usual method of dividing actual net proceeds by exact ton-mileage, are lower than those of other roads in the Dominion of Canada or of American roads. All of which, I think, is very interesting, coming from an independent critic. (Applause.)

We cannot deal with all the details and the branch lines constructed from time to time. But this brings us to the next epoch in railway development in Canada. The first attempt to collect and arrange railway statistics in Canada was made in 1860. At that time there were 16 companies operating in the country, with a total mileage of 1,880, or, if we include the mileage of the connecting lines on the American side under Canadian control, 2,107 miles. Statistics gathered in 1875-6 show that the number of railways in operation had increased from 16 to 37, and the total mileage from 2,107 to 5,157.

After the British North America Act was passed in 1867, in the year 1869 we find that the Dominion of Canada undertook to purchase that great unknown land around Hudson Bay, which is sometimes called Rupert's Land, because given by Charles II to his cousin Prince Rupert. By an amendment to the B.N.A. Act in 1871, the Dominion was enabled to carve out a province there, which entered the Union in 1870 as Manitoba. British Columbia was then asked to come into the Confederation in 1871, but the people of the colony, like those of the Maritime Provinces, lying separated from the other provinces by those barren, inhospitable shores of Lake Superior, by the great wilderness of prairie land, and by two great ranges of mountains, said there was little use of their coming into the Confederation unless united to the rest of Canada, so they too made the condition that a railway should be built to connect them with the rest of Canada. The history of that road is familiar to every Canadian, to every Canadian school boy. A fight was waged around that road which was sufficient to wreck ministries and destroy the reputations of many eminent politicians, yet you and I, as members of the Canadian Club, can have the feeling of gratitude for that undertaking, which has, in a very short time, as we count time, grown to be one of the greatest, if not the greatest carrying road in the world to-day.

I find by reference to statistics in my office, that the Canadian Pacific Railway has 75,000 officers and employees on its pay roll, of whom 70,000 reside in Canada. Its pay roll is \$3,700,000 per month. It has a fleet of 72 vessels, with a registered tonnage of 213,198, and a carrying capacity of 28,986 passengers and 139,410 tons of cargo. And the gross earnings for the year ending June 30th, 1912, amounted to \$123,319,541,—on a road that it was said would not pay axle grease!

These, then, are some of the interesting and vital statistics in connection with the railway development in Canada; but

that is not all. Less than twenty-five years after that tremendous struggle,—and that is considered a brief period in the history of a nation—we find placed on the statute books of Canada this remarkable statement. I read in the Statutes of Canada, 3 Edward VIII, 1903, the following: “An Act respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.” The preamble reads: “Whereas by reason of the growth in population, and the rapid development in the productiveness and trade of Canada, and especially the Western portion thereof, and with a view to opening up new territory,” etc. “Whereas by reason of the growth and rapid development of the Dominion of Canada,” then the Parliament of Canada assembled found it necessary to undertake the building of a second transcontinental railway! That work was undertaken, gentlemen, and I find on looking up statistics in my office that 2,350 miles are in actual operation on the new Transcontinental west of Winnipeg, and we have the assurance of the Minister of Railway and Canals that within a year it will be completed from Winnipeg to Moncton. Thus we shall by that time have two transcontinental railways, the Canadian Pacific, already built, and this new line, built by the Government through a Commission from Moncton to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg west to Prince Rupert by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a line of splendid construction and low grade. And the Grand Trunk Railway already has 8,000 miles of road between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic coast, with 840½ miles of double track from Montreal to Chicago, this being the longest continuous stretch of double track under one management in the world.

But, gentlemen, it would be unfair if one were to undertake to give the complete railway development of Canada without a reference at least to two eminent Canadian railway builders. Early in the history of railway growth in this country, we had two men in the Dominion who were laying plans, taking up here and there railways, or portions of railways that already existed, or were being constructed, and now we have well on the way a third transcontinental railway as a result—I refer to Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann, of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

So the people of Canada are in the position to-day of realizing within a very short time, no less than three transcontinental railways, spanning this country from ocean to ocean. And yet, notwithstanding all this railway construction that has taken place, we are told that there is territory five times as large as the United Kingdom in Canada in which no railway has been constructed, north of the 55th parallel!

These are some of the vital statistics. The Government is undertaking, as you know, to build a railway from The Pas to Hudson Bay. That is, like others that have been and will be constructed, the work of men of broad grasp of mind, of those men who are blest with depth of vision, who are the nation builders of the world. These are men who will take certain fair, judicious risks, in order to develop a country rich in natural resources such as the Dominion of Canada.

There are two or three interesting facts in connection with railway development which I have thus rapidly and briefly sketched. In the first place, the first railway built was on the south side of the River St. Lawrence, while the City of Montreal is on the north side. Even at that time Montreal was a very pretentious and very aggressive city, for the men of that time felt it necessary to construct a bridge across the St. Lawrence in order to get the benefit of the new railway. To Alexander M. Ross, an eminent English engineer, must be given the credit for designing the plans for the construction of that bridge. The bridge was opened by the late King Edward, then the Prince of Wales, on December 17th, 1859, and is known as the Victoria Bridge. And suffice it to say with regard to that great engineering undertaking, that when it was found necessary, owing to increasing traffic, to build a larger structure to make room for increasing vehicular and also pedestrian traffic, the contractor said that the most difficult part of his contract was the tearing down of the old structure. I think no stronger testimony could be given of the splendid work of the engineers of those days.

Another fact showing the steadily increasing trade between the country to the south and the Dominion of Canada, was the building of the Suspension Bridge across the Niagara River. It also had to be later replaced by a large structure, and now there is a single steel span of 559 feet, which is 226 feet above the water with an upper deck 30 ft. wide, carrying two tracks, and a lower deck 57 ft. wide, with a central carriage way, and a broad pavement on each side, providing for traffic both vehicular and pedestrian. The new bridge was opened in 1897.

You remember another very great undertaking was the building of the Sarnia Tunnel. Probably none of our railway constructions is more interesting to us, or more familiar, than the Sarnia Tunnel, because it has been brought up to the most modern standards in use, and has kept increasing in traffic, and because of its electrification, so that now powerful engines of 2,000 horsepower are used hauling heavy trains at a speed of from 10 to 25 miles per hour.

Now the question that arises in the mind of everybody is, what has been the result of this construction? Well, let us briefly for a moment look at Canada as we found it and the Canada of to-day. Fancy, if you can, the picture that will be presented when all these magnificent waterways to which I have alluded, have been harnessed in electrical energy, and the hum of machinery in the factories reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific will drown even the roar of Niagara! Already we have commenced that work. To-day we are grinding pulp, and sawing lumber grown in the rich valleys and on the mountain sides washed by these wondrous streams, by the energy they themselves supply. And yet in Canada we are only at the beginning of things.!

Those inhospitable shores of Lake Superior, where Colonel, afterwards Lord Wolseley, in circumstances when the greatest dispatch was required, took two months to go 450 miles, are no longer the obstacle they were; to-day we are bridging the continent, and shortening the distance between Winnipeg and Liverpool. Those black lands have been opened to the plow, and in Saskatchewan alone we have the largest single area devoted to wheat on the North American continent, producing 97,000,000 bushels of that golden grain. We have in the Prairie Provinces no less than 11,000,000 acres, and in the Dominion of Canada we have 33,000,000 acres under crop. We are turning out the golden grain for these roads and through these wondrous waterways until we have become the market gardeners and bread producers of the whole Empire.

In 1853, at the City of Toronto, the first locomotive engine built in Canada was constructed by James Good,—it was called "The Toronto." To-day we have locomotive works in the Dominion capable of turning out from 900 to 1,000 engines per year, and car shops turning out from 80,000 to 90,000 cars yearly.

The total mileage of railways in Canada to-day is 26,500 exclusive of sidings and terminals; we have 8,000 miles of terminals and yards to carry on the mighty traffic of this young giant Dominion of Canada; and no less than 9,000 miles of railway under construction at the present time. Our railways employ 141,244 people, and their pay roll amounts to \$74,613,738 per annum.

We have more than 19,000 factories in Canada, with an invested capital of over one and a quarter billion dollars. They employ half a million people, and their wage bill is over a quarter billion dollars per annum. All of which is due to the **energy, the industry, and the perseverance** of this young Canadian people.

These railroads have brought the cold waters of the Atlantic into close touch with the warm waters of the Pacific. We here, in this great commercial city of Toronto, with its grand buildings and marts of trade, are but the pulse beats of the mighty throbs of those waves striking upon the shores of those two oceans. We owe to the railway builders much of our prosperity and progress in Canada to-day.

Sometimes, in thinking of the glorious West, and all we owe to it, we are disposed to forget how much we owe to the East. Because, after all, it is the industry of the East that has made it possible to gather the wealth together, making possible the carrying on of all these great highways.

Now, gentlemen, I have tried very briefly within the few minutes allowed me, to bring together statistics of the growth and development of the railways of this country. As I said, we are but at the beginning. We have in this country probably one of the richest countries in the world to-day. There is every possibility in our natural resources. Those wondrous storehouses which, in the early days were said to be but a sea of mountains, are, after all, great storehouses containing wealth and riches of precious metals and minerals, and those great black diamonds that for centuries to come will be the basis of our industry, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with the iron ores at Sydney and in British Columbia. For given iron and coal, is there any man in this room who would predict what the outcome will be in this country less than a quarter of a century hence? Is there a man of depth and breadth of imagination sufficient to undertake to limit the possibilities and boundaries of this great country, along all the pathways I have endeavored very briefly to describe? (Applause.)

(December 16th, 1912.)

The Port of Montreal.

BY MR. C. C. BALLANTYNE.*

AT a regular meeting of the Canadian Club held on the 16th Dec., 1912, Mr. C. C. Ballantyne said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I must thank you, sir, first of all for the very flattering manner in which you have been good enough to introduce me to so many of my friends, and also to the members of this flourishing Club.

I have chosen for my subject to-day, gentlemen, "The Port of Montreal;" but that is really a misnomer, because it should be called "One of Canada's National Ports," inasmuch as the millions that have been spent for its development during the past fifteen or sixteen years are monies we got from the Dominion Government, and you, gentlemen, who live in the Queen City and those who live all over the Dominion of Canada naturally have as much interest in the port of Montreal as the commissioners themselves or those who happen to live there.

And I want to congratulate the people of Toronto, and especially the Harbor Commissioners, upon the very comprehensive scheme you have laid out for the development of your own harbor, at an outlay of nineteen million dollars. I think this work will be perfectly safe in the hands of the gentlemen you have so wisely chosen to be your Harbor Commissioners, and I look forward to seeing not only the port of Toronto but the whole city very greatly improved by the large development plan you are to undertake here.

I think, sir, that a brief sketch from the date of the organization of the Harbor Commission of Montreal to the present time, might be of interest to you. The Board at present consists of three Commissioners, Major George Washington Stephens, Mr. L. E. Geoffrion, and your humble servant. But I will go farther back than the time of the present Commission, more especially as at the close of the year we retire from

* Mr. Charles Colquhoun Ballantyne is one of the largest manufacturers in Montreal, prominent in the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and active in the Montreal Board of Trade and the Montreal Chambre de Commerce. From 1907 to 1912 he was a member of the Montreal Harbor Commission which has reconstructed the port and achieved much for navigation on the St. Lawrence.

office. The Harbor Commission is an old institution indeed, dating back to the year 1830. Strange to say, as far back as that the Governor in Council brought in an Act to carry on certain improvements wanted in the port of Montreal, and appointed a Harbor Commission composed of three men, Hon. George Moffat, Jules Quesnel, and Captain Robert S. Piper.

These gentlemen remained in office just six years, like the present Board, going out in 1836. The Board remained the same in number, three, until 1855, when it was increased to five. It remained of that size till 1873, when the Board was increased to nine. This was its number till 1894, when the Board was again increased to eleven members, six of whom were appointed by the Dominion Government. The Mayor of Montreal had a seat on the Board, and the other members were representatives of the Montreal Board of Trade, the Montreal Corn Exchange, the shipping interests, and the *Chambre de Commerce*.

Now, you see, gentlemen, that was a large and unwieldy Board of eleven members; and the Dominion Government was in control in effect, as six of the eleven received their appointment at the hands of the Dominion Government. The Mayor held office only during his term as Mayor, the same as the representatives from the commercial bodies. I have no reflection whatever to cast upon the able men who composed the Harbor Board of 1894 and following years to the day we assumed office on the 2nd of January, 1907, but that the meetings should all be in harmony could not be expected. You all know how everything dragged on in connection with the port of Montreal. I may say, sir, that things were in a deplorable state when we assumed office on the 2nd of January, 1907. The port of Montreal was literally steeped in politics, and the port lacked the facilities necessary, so that the country and the port lost a great deal of trade, owing to the fact that these men were hampered with politics and all that goes with it,—patronage, and so on.

Therefore the Dominion Government decided to abolish the old Board of eleven members, and appoint the present Harbor Commissioners, three in number, and to give the new Board a perfectly free hand to carry on the much needed improvements in the port of Montreal entirely free from political influences of any kind.

Myself and my colleagues did not seek office. We were all busy men, and while we appreciated the honor we were not anxious to add to our duties, because we rather shrank back from so heavy a task as was set before us, and to do our own

business as well. But anyway, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur stuck at us for six months, and we finally accepted office.

I can never forget the impression upon the minds of my colleagues and myself, as we entered that office of the Harbor Commission after our appointment. That building was more like a haunted house than any other kind; there had been no new furniture put there for twenty years; the carpet was worn out; the place was all dingy and dirty. One of the first things we did was to ask the caretaker, who had held that office for twenty years, to hand in his resignation, and we got a new one. Also we had a painter come in and fix up the place.

That week, when we came to look at the port itself, we found things in a most confused state. We found that a contract had been let in 1904 for the erection of fourteen double-deck steel sheds, but that at that time, three years later, only five had been partially completed. The Government of the day had a representative engineer, and the Harbor Commissioners had one also, and whatever the Government engineer would approve of the Harbor Commissioners' engineer would not agree with, and *vice versa*. The contractors were delayed so long, that they presented a bill of damages against the Commission, which they presented in our first week, for \$720,000, for loss of time, advance in the price of steel, etc. This claim was settled afterwards by the Board after a small committee of experts had looked thoroughly into the whole situation, for the sum of \$335,000, and from that date to this there has not been one dollar of extras in connection with the completion of these fourteen steel sheds and the new ones that have been erected since. We made up our minds that the first step we should have to take was to ask Mr. John Kennedy, who was also almost totally blind, to resign his position as engineer. Another thing was that the contractor for the steel sheds hated our former engineer so much that they would not meet under the same roof with him.

We paid the contractors \$5,000 per shed extra, and put in concrete floors so that when the vessels arrived in the spring their cargoes would not be unloaded in mud. We hastened on the work, and got the sheds finished; had the wharves paved, and much more done.

When we found it necessary to do our work on a comprehensive plan, the same as you are doing here, to make sure of the work being done rightly we sent over to England, and brought out one of the best harbor engineers we could get. He stayed with us for the season of navigation. We asked him

to furnish us with a twenty-five-year development plan. We also asked our own engineer, Mr. Cowie, to do the same. Our engineer did not see the plan of the English engineer, nor did the English engineer see our engineer's plan. So when these two big plans were ready the Harbor Commissioners thought it wise to get a Board of seven of the most capable engineers throughout the country to examine them. They took several weeks to look into the plans carefully, and finally made the unanimous decision, I am glad to tell you, recommending the plan of the Board's own Chief Engineer, Mr. Frederick W. Cowie. (Applause.)

As soon as we had this decision, we sent the plan to Ottawa, because all plans have to go to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. And I want to say this, gentlemen, at this time: when the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked us to become Harbor Commissioners, we met Hon. Mr. Brodeur and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and said that on one condition only would we accept office,—we must have an entirely free hand, we were not going to be hampered by political influences from Ottawa or from any other direction; and I am very happy indeed to tell you that during all the time the late Government was in power we were not interfered with in the slightest degree whatever. So, rightly or wrongly, the responsibility must rest on the shoulders of the Commissioners alone.

One of the first acts of the Commissioners on coming into office was to call the permanent staff together, and Major Stephens told them politics was a thing of the past, and that any man using his influence to get promotion or in any other direction would be immediately dismissed. The Commissioners confirmed this by a letter to the head of each department, such as this one to Mr. F. W. Cowie, the Chief Engineer:

Dear Sir,—Please issue an order to the heads of your different departments that any man using political influence to retain his position, or to aid in his promotion, will be asked at once for his resignation, and let it be distinctly understood from now on that positions on any of the staffs under the present Commission are held only as long as the holder performs efficiently his duties.

Now, I am not going to touch on anything political: that is tabooed at all these clubs; but I would just like to say this, with your kind permission: that the best people in the city of Montreal, in the transportation business and other lines, say that the work we have done has been carried on on broad national lines, entirely free from politics. And you also know

that the Public Service Commission gave us a clean bill of health a few days ago. It employed one of the best firms of auditors to report to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I am very pleased to say they gave us a perfectly clean bill of health, and their report says that everything is carried on on proper business lines. (Applause.)

I also want to say that the present Minister of Marine, Mr. Hazen, has not interfered with us or our work. So we have received the most loyal support, both from the former Minister and from the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Now, we found it necessary to organize. For example, before the present Board took office all the different railroads did all their own shunting at the wharves, with the result that there was great congestion and confusion. One railway would block the others, so the people in general and the steamship companies were not getting the service they ought to get. So we created a Traffic Department to do all the shunting on the wharves. Of course we charge the railway companies so much per car for every car going on the wharves. The Commission owns eight locomotives now, and handled this year 120,000 freight cars. So we found that a very good thing to have inaugurated.

We also organized a Purchasing Department, and such a thing as patronage is entirely unknown in the Harbor Commissioners' office. We have a Purchasing Department, just as you gentlemen have, and large things, such as steel, are generally called for by tender, and the contracts are let for the gross amount to the lowest bidder. We have had a telephone exchange put in, and a system of reports prepared, so we can keep closely in touch with all departments.

We found also that the port of Montreal was losing the heavy weights, because there was no facility for handling them, so that they went by Boston or New York. So we placed an order for a 75-ton floating crane. During the past season 633 heavy pieces were lifted by this crane, which would otherwise have been shipped by American ports.

We found it necessary to increase the Harbor Commissioners' equipment in other ways. I may say also with regard to revenue here, that the only charge is a rental which the steamship companies pay for the double-deck steel sheds, at only the actual rate of interest the Dominion Government charges the Harbor Commissioners. Sometimes you hear people say that the port of Montreal is a very dear port, that one is charged there more than at New York, Boston, and other ports. We know all about the rates at these others, and I can

truthfully say that I do not know of any port that gives as good facilities and as cheap as Montreal. (Applause.)

The big bulk of our revenue does not come from the steamship companies, only about one-eighth of it is from that source. The balance is from wharfages on out-bound and in-bound freight, charges for handling freight cars on the wharves, and rentals of sheds and spaces to coal companies, etc. The revenue this year has been about a million dollars.

The money we require to carry out large works, what we call capital expenditures, previously was raised by issuing debentures, but since 1896 the Harbor Commissioners have borrowed it from the Dominion Government, and paid interest on it right along. The interest amounts to a little over \$500,000 a year. I do not know whether my good friend, Mr. Gourlay, is going to pay interest on the \$6,000,000 he has borrowed from the Government; but no doubt he will. (Laughter.)

The Harbor Commissioners of Montreal have had advanced to them by the Dominion Government since 1896 the sum of seventeen million dollars, of which \$10,500,000 has been spent by the present Board during its term of office.

To show how we have increased business by installing modern plant and machinery, just as you gentlemen find in your own businesses, I am pleased to inform you that during the past six years the increased port facilities have induced the following new steamship lines to come to the port of Montreal: the White Star Line, that has in its fleet the two magnificent passenger liners, the "Laurentic" and "Megantic"; the Canada Line, between Montreal and Rotterdam and Hamburg; the Canadian Northern S.S. Co., between Montreal and Bristol; the Cunard Line, between Montreal, Southampton and London; the New Zealand Line, and also a French Line of direct service between Montreal and France that will inaugurate the opening of navigation in 1913.

But, gentlemen, we have not the facilities that we ought to have. We have fifteen double-deck steel sheds and four one-story concrete sheds. But that is not a sufficient number. If we had six more double-deck sheds they would all be in use now. We have had everything pushed forward as rapidly as possible, but you understand that with only seven months in our season, from the first of May, our time is short; but we have 2,400 to 3,000 men constantly working.

We have been able to get very large cold meat shipments from across the line, especially from Chicago. This is owing to the Harbor Commissioners' tracks being placed alongside

of each permanent freight shed. It takes only a minute to put the meat from the refrigerator car into the refrigerated compartment of the hold of the steamer, thus doing away with any liability to atmospheric or climatic interference. These meats command a higher price when they reach the other side, owing to better facilities provided in the port of Montreal, than when shipped by American ports.

Another product which comes largely to Montreal is nitrate, which comes from the west coast of Chili. Instead of being sent through the port of New Orleans, and transferred to the small Mississippi steamers, and afterwards put into box cars to be delivered to the DuPont Company in Illinois, it now comes via Montreal, being there transferred to the steamers of the Powder Company, and they find it very much better, notwithstanding the distance of 12,500 miles.

Now I just wanted to say a word about the grain facilities of the port of Montreal. When the Commissioners assumed office, there was just one elevator belonging to the Harbor Board, No. 1, but the grain conveyer system had not been installed, and less than 500,000 bushels of grain was handled in this elevator in 1907. In 1912 more than 16,000,000 bushels was handled in No. 1 elevator alone. We have grain conveyer galleries stretching from the elevator over the tops of those sheds; and in each are rubber belts, most of them produced by my friend, Mr. Candee, here, so I don't need to say anything about their superior quality. They have a capacity of 15,000 bushels per hour for each belt, and the grain is tripped off the belt into dock spouts and put into the steamer. There are seventeen ocean berths, so that each steamer may lie at her berth and be loaded and a steamer does not need to move while being loaded. I do not know any other harbor that can handle grain as quickly and cheaply.

A new concrete elevator, No. 2, has been erected, the most modern and best equipped on the continent, with a storage capacity of 2,600,000 bushels. And we have just had plans approved at Ottawa for adding to the capacity of No. 1 elevator a million and a half bushels. So by the end of next year the port of Montreal will have a total storage capacity, including the Grand Trunk Elevator "B," of six million bushels.

Our elevator No. 2 is fireproof, and so designed that it can take grain from two lake vessels at the same time, as there is a jetty, so a steamer can lie on each side. Also we can take in grain from railroad cars, and send it out by the grain conveyer system to the seventeen ocean vessels. The total handling capacity is three million bushels per day, in and out. So

you see the port of Montreal is not lacking so far as storage capacity is concerned for grain.

But we no sooner get over one difficulty than we are confronted with another! I suppose it will always be so in the transportation business. The terminal facilities on the Great Lakes and at Quebec, Halifax and St. John are entirely inadequate. The matter that concerns me most is this: The West produces something like 200,000,000 bushels of wheat alone, besides large quantities of oats, barley and flax, and I don't know how all that grain is going to follow Canadian routes and get to ocean ports. Take last season, for instance: our elevator was full of grain; the Grand Trunk elevator, with a capacity of a million bushels, was full also; the Harbor Commissioners' fleet of floating elevators was ready waiting to elevate the grain from the lake steamers, had there been ocean steamers there in sufficient numbers to take the grain away; but now they can get so much better rates for freight, that the great difficulty we find is to get ocean steamer space to take the grain away. Our floating elevators were free and lying alongside, but the lake boats were unable to discharge their cargo. The consequence is that several were withdrawn from the route, and that means so much greater difficulty for the rest.

I do not like to impose any more hard work upon my loyal friend and hard worker, Mr. Gourlay, but I would like if you would have your Association take up the question of marine insurance rates, which was taken up at Ottawa at the meeting of the Manufacturers' Association. You, gentlemen, are aware that no tramp vessels come to Montreal, only regular liners come there. One reason is that Lloyds charge higher rates on the hulls of tramp vessels than on those of regular liners; although the insurance rates also are higher than on regular liners going to New York and Boston. So I would like to see the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Harbor Commissions, and Boards of Trade, put their heads together to see if they could not organize a Canadian Lloyds. The Government is willing to co-operate. And I would like to see tramp vessels get a rebate of the difference between the insurance rate now paid on regular liners and what they pay; because unless something is done to get more vessels I don't see much use spending millions and millions on terminal facilities. I hope before very long this difficulty will be overcome, so that our transportation routes will be able to carry not only all the grain grown in Canada, but also a great proportion of that grown in the United States.

I would like also to see the Dominion Government proceed as quickly as possible to deepen the Welland Canal to 24 feet. We have heard so much about this naval question lately that other things seem forgotten. I have not heard a single word about the deepening of the Welland Canal to 24 feet, or about the building of the Georgian Bay Canal. I would like to see those matters taken up. We cannot afford to lose any time. If Canada wants to hold her great carrying trade, she must provide as quickly as possible to build the Georgian Bay Canal and to deepen the Welland, rush her transcontinental railroads through, enlarge all her transportation facilities, and do all she can to provide facilities to take the grain away.

I have not any right to make suggestions to the Government at all, but I would like to see a Commission of three men appointed, one member to represent the grain men, one a transportation expert, and the third a business man. I would like the Dominion Government to say to these Commissioners: "Study the transportation routes of Canada carefully. We want you to go to the Pacific coast, and find out whether it is practicable for Vancouver to become a great export shipping city, whether the prairie grain can be carried across the two ranges of mountains to the Pacific; also whether it is practicable or feasible for us to ship by the Hudson Bay route." I am free to say, that it is all right to build a railroad there, but I have never met a transportation or steamship man who considers the Hudson Bay route practicable or feasible. I think it is a shame for any man to talk of spending millions of dollars on terminal facilities either at Fort Nelson or to Fort Churchill, until we make perfectly sure that grain boats can be sent by that route. These steamship men say you would need a special class of steamers, and that the route is so dangerous that no one could get steamers to take the grain away by that route. So this Commission that the Government would appoint, would also see what terminals are necessary at the head of the Great Lakes, on the Georgian Bay, and at the sea ports; also carefully investigate to ascertain how Canadian grain is carried at a lower rate from Fort William to Buffalo than from Fort William to Canadian ports. All these are only links in the transportation chain, but all these inquiries are necessary if the Government is to have concrete information before it spends millions on terminal facilities, which would be unwise unless we are sure they are going to be useful to carry our grain. There is more grain grown now in Canada, and will be grown, than all the ports of Canada can possibly handle, so if it can be shipped by Vancouver and Hudson Bay,

there will be plenty of cargoes offering. All I would ask is that the Government should not spend millions of dollars on ports that will not help to carry our grain.

The Harbor Commissioners of Montreal made arrangements with the famous British firm of Vickers, Limited, to establish itself in the city of Montreal. The firm was formerly Vickers, Sons & Maxim, but was changed, and is now the Vickers, Limited. We have reclaimed from the bed of the river by dredging some thirty acres of land, and on this the Canadian Vickers, Ltd., is going to erect a large and modern shipbuilding plant. This firm is going to be able to build merchant marine vessels from the smallest to the greatest, and I may remark that it is going to be able to build also war vessels of all sorts and sizes, from a submarine up to a super-Dreadnought. (Applause.) I proceed no farther on that point, because I am on very delicate ground. (Laughter.) But I think I can safely say that the company is there and ready for this business.

We have also made arrangements with the Canadian Vickers, Ltd., to build a floating drydock. His Royal Highness recently unveiled the drydock "Duke of Connaught," which will have a lifting capacity of 27,500 tons. When a vessel requires repairs, it will go into the dock, and by compressed air the floating dock will be raised, bringing the ship with it. There are twenty vessels using the St. Lawrence to-day which are so large that the drydock at Point Levis could not accommodate them at all, so I am sure you are glad that the new floating drydock at Montreal will be big enough not only to take these large steamers, but also will have a capacity equal to lifting so large a tonnage as 27,500 tons.

Now I find my time is up. I have only referred, in a very brief manner, to the work carried out during our term of office. And I want to say that though very reluctant to accept office, I have spent six of the happiest years of my life in the work of the Harbor Commission in association with my two very able colleagues. During these six years we never had a cross word and never quarreled. And together with our loyal and efficient staff we have all pulled together as one man to do our duty to develop that national port of Canada with the country's money. (Applause.)

(January 8th, 1913.)

The Everlasting Balkans.

BY PROF. L. E. HORNING, PH.D.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on January 8th, Prof. Horning said:—

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen.—If one looks at a geological map of Europe, one will at once see that the Balkan peninsula contains some of the oldest rock formations in the world. Therefore from this standpoint alone the title of this lecture is amply justified.

This same district must have been one of the earliest highways for the passage of people from Europe to Asia and contrariwise. Indeed, very early in the known history of the world, in the days of the Greek, we know that many a contest for superiority raged in Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece and about the Danube. Demosthenes thundered out his Philippics against the ruler of Macedon, as every classical student has good reason to know. The successor of the Greek Empires, the Roman, had its various contests with these Balkan peoples, and early in the Christian Era these districts were the scenes of renewed conflicts. Very shortly after the division under Constantine of the Latin Empire into the East and the West Roman Empire we meet, in what is now Roumania, with the Goths who were converted to Christianity about 361 A.D. The Bible was then translated from Greek into their tongue, thus giving us our earliest extended knowledge of a Teutonic speech.

Beginning with the third, but taking place mostly in the sixth and seventh centuries, we find abundant evidence of a movement of Slavic peoples towards the Balkan countries, and it is still with their descendants in Servia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Macedonia and Roumania that the Turks are having to do. It will thus be seen that down to the fall of the Western Roman Empire, 476 A.D., and for two or three centuries later, there had been a continual changing and displacement going on which must have meant,

* Professor Lewis Emerson Horning, B.A., Ph.D., was adjunct professor of Classics and Theories at Victoria University from 1886 to 1891, and Professor of German and Old English up to 1905, in which year he became Professor of Teutonic Philology.

and our meagre historical records said did mean, war, bloodshed and struggle almost without ceasing.

The Eastern Roman Empire, sometimes called the Greek or the Byzantine, continued intact from its origin under Constantine in 324 A.D., until the fall of Constantinople in 1453, although its existence from 1204, when it was captured by the Crusaders, was precarious in the extreme. Three peoples were its implacable foes, the Bulgars from 660 A.D. on, the Russians from the ninth century, but the great, long continued contest was with people of the Mohammedan faith to which it and the Bulgarians both finally succumbed. As is well known this faith, the third of Semitic origin, and the only one which is still professed by large bodies of Semitics, originated with Mohammed, from whose Hegira or flight from Mecca to Medina in 622 dates the Mohammedan era.

The first of these Moslems were the Saracens who made such a remarkable succession of conquests during the seventh and eighth centuries, and who met with defeat before Constantinople in 673, and again in 716. This latter battle might well be called one of the decisive battles of the world. Foiled in their attempts upon Constantinople they had also been sweeping along the north coast of Africa, had crossed over into Spain in 711 under Gebel Tarik, whence Gibraltar, overran the most of that country, and then poured over the Pyrenees into France to meet with a crushing defeat at the hands of Charles Martel, 732, at Tours. The great National Epic of France, the Song of Roland, goes back to the struggles with the Saracens, who were not driven out of South-Western Europe until 1492.

In the southeast we hear little of the Saracens after about the middle of the eleventh century. It was the Seljuk Turks, who displace them from about 1055 to 1315. This people came out of Central Asia, gave aid to the Caliph of Bagdad, but soon took possession of his dominions and overran Asia Minor. The Mongols under Zenghis Khan were their great rivals, though not for long, and it was against these Turks that Western Christendom arose in answer to the fiery appeals of Peter the Hermit, and others who wished to free the Holy City from the grasp of the Infidel. The Crusades, from 1095 to 1272, had a wide-reaching effect upon Church, State, Society and Literature. Among the celebrated warriors of these Crusades are counted Richard the Lionhearted of England and the generous-minded Saladin, leader of the Turks.

About 1227 we hear of another branch of the Turkish family, again from Central Asia, with whom we still have

to do, viz., the Ottoman Turks. The Ottomans in their career of conquest reached the Bosphorus in 1355, crossed over and took Gallipoli, in 1361 Adrianople, and in 1364 the city of Philippopolis. Then fear fell upon Southeast Europe. Rightly, for in 1389 the Servians had lost their independence at Kossovo, and in their great cycle of national song we find those terrible events crystallized. We first hear of an Ottoman Navy about 1420, and in 1453 the ancient city of Constantinople at last fell into their hands. Every student of literature and history knows how important that event was for the spread of the New Learning, doubly important because it coincided with that other great event, the invention of printing, and was followed soon after by the discovery of America. One might well say that that the Middle Ages came to an end and the Modern Era began with that year. The Turks continued their all-conquering advance. In 1458-9 Servia, Bosnia, Wallachia and Albania became Turkish provinces, and in 1497-98 Poland, one of the Christian nations upon whom fell the brunt of the attack, Hungary being the other, was thoroughly devastated. It is during this time that we find Tsar and Sultan first having political relations. Under Selim I (1512-20) the extent of the Ottoman Dominions was all but doubled, Egypt being conquered and the title *Caliph* conferred upon the Sultan by its last Arab (Egyptian) holder. Persia, the foe in the rear, which was always giving trouble, and in the end helped to weaken the Ottoman power, was also conquered by Selim. From 1520 to 1566 the Ottoman ruler was the great Suleiman I, (Solomon), the Magnificent, a worthy compeer of Francis I of France, Charles V of Germany, and Henry VIII of England. In his reign the Ottoman Empire reached its greatest extent and highest glory. In 1521 war was declared against Hungary, whose armies suffered disastrous defeat at Mohács, 1526, and in 1529 Vienna was besieged for the first time. At the close of the reign, the Turkish army, led by capable generals, numbered at least 200,000 tried warriors, of whom 20,000 were Janissaries; the navy, too, was efficient and under the command of five or six very skilful admirals. The Empire was well governed in its great extent from Persia to the confines of Germany, from Egypt to Morocco; the Black Sea was a Turkish lake; all the Balkan peninsula except Montenegro was in the power of the Turks. During this reign diplomatic relations were entered into with France in the Capitulations of 1534, and a French Ambassador was received at Constantinople in 1535. Before the end of the century the

Ottoman power was one of the "European Concert." England's first ambassador was William Harebone, appointed in 1581, and Elizabeth claimed the Sultan's friendship on the ground that "both were fighting idolaters."

The decay of the Ottoman Empire began with the successors of Suleiman I, viz.: Selim II (1566-74) and Murad III (1574-95) who was a notorious weakling. But this decay was not so general that the Turks were not able to defend themselves valiantly. The naval glory of Turkey suffered a setback at Lepanto (1571), in battle with the Venetians who in the next century were to have such a great part in contributing to Turkey's lessening power. In 1568 we hear of the clash of Turk and Russian, that third force to cripple the conquering Ottoman. In fact the wars carried on by the Turks against other Mohammedan countries weakened them all and gave Russia the opportunity to expand.

There had been continual conflict with Austria, to become the successor of Hungary, marked with several peaces, more or less badly kept, in 1568, 1573, 1576 and 1584, and then the long war, 1593-1606, which ended with the peace of Sitvatorok, notable because it marks the end of Turkey's era of conquest.

The seventeenth century was fateful for the Turk. A long war with Venice (1644-69) thoroughly weakened her on the sea, Russia and Poland were aggressive, and finally in 1681 the Ukraine was ceded to Russia, which was a first step in the direction of making the Black Sea Russian. There was, however, a sudden change when Kara Mustafa, taking advantage of the Hapsburg's harsh treatment of the Hungarian Protestants, declared war and besieged Vienna with a huge army in 1683. The court fled, but John Sobieski of Poland led the combined Christian forces to victory, beat back the Turks and saved Western Christendom. Coalitions against the Turks became the order of the day. Such was the success of the various foes that Turkey was glad to conclude the peace of Karlowitz (1699). It marks the end of her power of offence and the first dismemberment of her Empire. It is also the end of the first stage of the Eastern question, viz., how far will the Turks be able to advance to the west?

The second stage of the Everlasting Balkan question was: how long will it take the Turkish Empire to fall to pieces? A comparatively small body of Asiatic conquerors ruling over subject people of very different nationalities and ideals, Serbs, Croats, Bulgars, Vlachs, Greeks, how long will the Turks be

able to maintain their supremacy? As events have proved, a good long time.

In the eighteenth century it is quite evident that Turkey had grown weaker because it took no advantage of an old time opponent during the wars of the Austrian succession (1740-45) or in the Seven years war (1756-63). Austria had been looking for an opportunity to expand through the Balkans towards Constantinople, as is plainly evident in the wars of the Polish succession (1736-7), and in the terms of the Peace of Belgrade (1739).

The real aggressor during this century was Russia which like Turkey, was little affected by the revolutionary movements taking place in Western Europe. Slavic Russia fomented trouble among the kindred Slavs of Servia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Roumania, and as the land of the Orthodox Greek Church, assumed the right to look after the interests of the Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. Peter the Great and Catherine II both cherished dreams of driving the Turk from Europe, and in 1781 there was a vague arrangement to revive the Greek Empire at Constantinople under Constantine, a son of Catherine. There was a war with Turkey (1768-74), followed by the important peace of Kuchuk-Kainarji, of which the main points were that the Black Sea and the Archipelago were to be open to Russia's vessels, and the Tsar was to have the right to build a Greek Church at Constantinople, an entering wedge to further claims to protect the Christians. In 1784 the Crimea was absorbed by Russia, there was another peace with Austria (1791), and with Russia (1792), followed by a further war in 1806 which was suddenly closed by the treaty of Bukharest in 1812. At the same time she continued her activities among the Balkan peoples, and Servia rose in revolt in 1804.

While these movements were going on in Eastern Europe, Western Europe was in the throes of Revolution which resulted in the Reign of Terror in France, and in more or less disturbance in the neighboring countries. The appearance of Napoleon Bonaparte changed the whole state of affairs, and as one after another of the great countries suffered at his hands, it was finally necessary for them all to combine, which they did in 1813-15, to drive him into exile. At the Peace of Tilsit between France and Russia (1807), Turkey was a signatory power and the Treaty of Bukharest (1812) preserved Turkey as a neutral State, an important matter for Russia, who otherwise was open to attack by Persia, Austria, Turkey or France. The Congress of Vienna in

settling affairs in 1815, after Waterloo, omitted to guarantee the existence of Turkey, for the anxious aim of the diplomats was to preserve the *status quo* for fear that the disappointed Liberals of all countries would after all turn the world upside down. The Congresses of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Troppau (1819), Laibach (1820), and Verona (1822), all had this purpose in view, but affairs in Servia, which had ended in 1817 in autonomy under the nominal rule of the Sultan, and the revolt in Greece, 1820, all helped to upset their plans. Throughout Europe a tremendous enthusiasm greeted the uprising in the classic land of Greece, which is reflected in literature by the songs of Müller, Leconte de Lisle, and Byron. Her independence was acknowledged by Russia in 1829, and by all the Powers in 1832.

It now seemed as if the fall of Turkey were imminent and Tsar Nicholas I (1825-55) decided to eschew international politics to push his own plans in South-Eastern Europe. This marks the *third stage* of the eastern question, and it is noticeable that here is encountered the opposition of France, England and Italy. At the Convention of Akkerman (1826) Russia's demands on Turkey were acceded to, but the "un-toward incident" of Navarino (1827), when the Turkish Navy was blotted out by Russian and French vessels, caused the Sultan to call for an "Holy war," which resolved itself into a duel between Turkey and Russia, closed by the peace of Adrianople (1829). By its terms the Danubian principalities, the present Roumania, became practically independent, the rights of Russia to navigation of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles were recognized, and also Greek independence. All this was taking place in the reign of Mahmud II (1808-39), but the heaviest blow was still to come. This was the attack of Mehemet Ali of Egypt upon Syria to satisfy his claims for aid given during the revolt of Greece. England and France forced the Sultan to satisfy these, and the treaty of Unkiar Skelessi (1833) seemed to make Turkey quite dependent upon Russia. By it the Dardanelles were closed to all *foreign* war vessels. The eastern question reached quite an acute crisis when Abdul Mahmud (1839-61) came to the throne of Turkey. Mehemet Ali had to be satisfied, and to do this the powers of Europe took concerted action at the Convention in London, 1841, which resulted in Mehemet Ali being made hereditary pasha of Egypt, and in the Dardanelles being closed to *all* warships. The eastern question now seemed in a fair way of losing importance.

In the sketch thus far little has been said of reforms which from time to time had been forced upon various Sultans. The laws of the great Suleiman (1520-66) had themselves been of the nature of reforms but still the position of the non-mussulman subjects was extremely terrible. In fact it had been proposed in 1644 to have recourse to a state-ordered massacre, which, however, was not carried out. Mustafa Kuprili, vizier from 1689 to 1691, did improve the lot of these *rayas*, but the wars with the various powers and the risings in various provinces made matters very bad by engendering hatred and animosity on every hand. When in 1839 the new Sultan Mahmud proclaimed the *Tanzimat* or perfect equality of all subjects, though he was following up various partial reforms already instituted, his proclamation was met by contempt from without as well as by violent opposition at home. And yet progress was made from year to year.

The one power to whom a reformed Turkey was displeasing was Russia. The Tsar Nicholas I, who in 1833 had secretly agreed with his brother sovereigns to preserve the integrity of Turkey, felt that the Convention of London (1841) had robbed him of some advantages. He, therefore, made a proposal in 1844,—he called Turkey the "Sick Man" then, and the phrase has stuck,—repeated again in 1853, that Great Britain should receive Crete and Egypt, Constantinople be made a free city, and the Balkan States put under the protection of Russia. This was politely rejected and the Eastern question slumbered.

In 1850, however, Napoleon III, a restless ruler, suddenly raised the question of French rights to the "Holy Places" which had been encroached upon by the Russians, and as neither Russia nor France would arbitrate, and as the other powers advised the Sultan to resist Russia's claims to a protectorate over the Christians, because that involved the integrity of the Sultan's Empire, there was nothing left but war.

The Crimean war resulted in a humiliating peace for Russia in 1856 whereby the Danubian principalities were given an European guarantee, the condition of the Christian subjects of the Sultan was to be improved, the Black Sea was made neutral, and the integrity of the Ottoman Empire was assured as well as its place in the European Concert of nations.

We are now reaching a very important series of changes throughout Europe. The revolutionary ideas which had their birth in the latter part of the eighteenth century, though

hindered in development by the reaction of 1848-52, had produced various "national" movements. In 1861 the Danubian principalities were christened Roumania. Greece drove out the autocrat Otto in 1862. In 1863 there were Polish troubles. In 1859 Italy made a strong effort to fight through to unity which was accomplished in 1866 and 1870. Austria's expansion was, therefore, shut out in that direction. Prussia settled her differences with Denmark in 1864, with Hanover and Austria in 1866, and in 1870-71, at the head of the German States, she thoroughly humbled her old enemy France and returned from Versailles the head of the newly-founded German Empire. There was an uprising in Crete in 1868, and the Powers had to quiet Greece in 1869. Serbia and Montenegro had also been astir during "the sixties."

In 1875 the Eastern question again became acute. The extravagance of Sultan Abdul Aziz (1861-76) had plunged Turkey deeply into debt and, when Bosnia and Herzegovina rebelled (1875), the Turkish exchequer was all but exhausted. Bulgaria followed suit, the "Bulgarian atrocities" were perpetrated, and Europe was aroused. The new Sultan Abdul Hamid (1876—), hesitated about undertaking reforms, and Russia's Slav and Orthodox sympathies caused her to proclaim war. Except for the splendid defence of the Shipka pass and Plevna, the Russian advance was unchecked, and the contest was soon over. The treaty of San Stefano was very hard upon Turkey, for it provided for the independence of Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro with increased territories, for an autonomous Bulgaria to include East Roumelia, for the cession of Dobrudja and Bessarabia to Russia, an indemnity and various minor points. England opposed and the Treaty of Berlin (1878) revised the terms.

By the terms of the Berlin treaty Roumania became independent. Bulgaria was restricted to the district north of the Balkans and Eastern Roumelia, i.e., a major portion of Macedonia which had been given to Bulgaria by the treaty of San Stefano, was given back to the Sultan. Serbia was somewhat enlarged, the Sultan relinquished all claims to Montenegro and Greece was put off. Cyprus was handed over to England to be restored, if the promised reforms were carried out, and Russia made certain restorations also. Bosnia and Herzegovina were to be administered by Austria-Hungary. It is safe to say that no one was satisfied, and that no one expected the settlement would last for long. And so it proved. Roumania became a Kingdom in 1881 and elected a Hohenzollern who with his wife, Carmen Sylva,

has given good government to the country. Bulgaria rose in revolt in 1885 and annexed Eastern Roumelia, to which the Sultan had to agree. Alexander of Battenburg was chosen King, but he had a very troubled rule of two years, trying to please Russia, and then was glad to abdicate. Ferdinand of Cobourg was chosen to succeed him, and he has won his spurs. The conversion of his little son Boris to the Greek Church in 1896 helped mightily to make the father safe. Servia's appetite was whetted by Bulgaria's success, and an excuse was found for a war with Bulgaria which lasted two weeks and ended with loss for Servia. The history of King Milan and of his son Alexander was not edifying, and Servia has never secured the popular regard that the other States have enjoyed. King Peter ascended the throne in 1903. Montenegro went on her way peacefully. Greece has not played a very successful part, and in 1897 made a foolish war with Turkey in which she met defeat. It was Turkey herself which was hopeless. It was soon seen that the promised reforms were not likely to be carried out, and the chief sufferers were the Christians of Asia Minor and Macedonia. The Armenians were in trouble in 1890, and in 1894 and 1895 terrible massacres took place. In 1896 the Armenians attacked the bank in Constantinople, and again they suffered grievously. The disunion of the Powers allowed the great assassin to escape. Crete was a constant thorn in the Sultan's side, and in 1898 Greek influence became paramount. Macedonia, like Armenia, had never received the promised reforms and Servia, Bulgaria and Greece were conducting a racial propaganda. They all looked upon Macedonia as the natural direction for their own territorial expansion. Added to these troubles came the religious difficulties between the Greek Patriarch and the Bulgarian Exarch. In 1903 Russia and Austria drew up a plan of reform, but all was useless, troubles only increased.

Egypt had been rebellious all through until in 1881 it was necessary for England to interpose and assume a protectorate. At various times it was proposed to relinquish this, but finally the agreement of 1904 with the French made England's tenure permanent. France, had already taken over Algiers, took charge of Tunis in 1881, and Italy's late attack on Tripoli has completed the spoilation of the Turk in Africa.

In 1908 there was a very sudden and dramatic development of the Near Eastern question. The young Turks arose, overthrew the old Sultan and his useless government, prom-

ised all manner of reforms, and set up a constitutional Parliament. This was in July. Everybody rejoiced, churches and races gave thanks, and England, always a friend, was hopeful for Turkey. But in October Bulgaria proclaimed its independence, Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina and the boldest held his breath. In 1909 there was a brief counter revolution which was crushed. The young Turks did not punish the murderers of the Armenians at Adana, and seemed bent on establishing a military government, highly centralized. Crete proclaimed union with Greece to which there was little response. Turkey and Roumania came to an understanding in 1910. Russia, lamed by Japan in 1904, was powerless to answer effectively the Austrian moves when supported by Germany, and German influence increased at Constantinople and in Asia Minor. Then in 1911 Italy attacked Tripoli, and while peace negotiations were in progress between Italy and Turkey, there was a sudden declaration of war by the Balkan allies, Oct. 3, 1912, which was followed by a campaign very similar to the Franco-Prussian of 1870. Peace envoys met in London early in December and the powers looked on. Rumor says that Austria will not permit Serbia to have any more coastline on the Adriatic or annex Novi-Bazar, which would block her way to Salonica. At present no one knows what the upshot will be, because the allies seem to be in no yielding temper, and the Turks as usual hope to gain by procrastination.

Two or three things look fairly plausible. A Balkan alliance with a great deal of added territory would seem to shut the door to Germany's advance in Asia Minor and to shut off Austria's last chance of expansion. Will this new Alliance, composed largely of Slavs, be just another Slav Empire, a second Russia? How will Italy, a friend of England, act, especially if she should get a strip of Albanian coast and be able to make the Adriatic an Italian lake? Will she join with this new confederacy in opening a new field for English commerce? And what will England do? She has already one Slav Empire to deal with in Persia, the Middle East problem. Will she assure the Turk of Asia and help to make the greatest Mohammedan ruler the good friend and ally of the greatest Mohammedan Empire of the world, Great Britain? But she can scarcely afford in that case to see the Turk driven completely out of Europe. Constantinople must be neutral or friendly. And what of Germany? If the door to Asia is shut, and if Austria-Hungary is the next "Sick Man," as very many believe who know the troubled

history of that composite nation, then will not Germany and England have to become friends to resist the Slavs in Europe and in Asia? And what more natural alliance or more to be desired than that of Germany, Great Britain and the United States, Teuton-dom, to present a united front east and west in defence of the highest type of civilization the world knows!

(January 14th, 1913.)

The Progress of Prison Reform.

BY HON. W. J. HANNA.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 14th January, 1913, Hon. W. J. Hanna said:

Mr. President and Members of the Canadian Club,—I appreciate very much your kind invitation to address you to-day. I'd have appreciated it even more if I had been able to avoid accepting it! (Laughter.) But your President was so persistent that refusal was practically impossible, at least without more courage than I can boast of.

You know, with an earnestness that almost compelled belief, he explained to me how this Club had of late developed a thirst for knowledge with regard to prison work (laughter), and were very anxious to know what the present outlook is. (Laughter.) With equal earnestness, and I think I may safely add, with most admirable assurance, he went on to explain to me that he thought twenty-five or thirty minutes' talk from me would work a complete and permanent cure, and would prevent any possible outbreak of the kind again. Now you can quite understand it was very difficult indeed not to accept so gracious an invitation.

So much has been said and written in the past three or four years with regard to prison work in general, and so far as we are concerned particularly with regard to what we are trying to do in this Province of Ontario, that it is very difficult to go far or to say much without appearing to repeat, or to overlap what has already been better said by others. But if this may have its disadvantages it has its advantages as well, because it enables us to assume that you know generally what has taken place in this Province at least. We are able to start out and leave out of our discussion—our talk—to-day much of what has happened. We can take it for granted, for instance, that prison labor in this Province, as well as other

* Hon. William John Hanna, K.C., Provincial Secretary in the Whitney Government since 1905, sits for West Lambton in the Legislature. He was born in Middlesex county on October 13th, 1862. His is a vigorous personality. He is one of the most popular platform speakers of his day, a capable administrator, and heart and soul bound up in his pet hobby of prison reform which emphasizes the redemptive rather than the punitive side of penology.

Provinces and States and countries, has long been a difficult matter for governments to deal with; that you know we in 1907 appointed a committee of the Legislature to investigate and report, that by 1908 it reported, and that its report was, in line with what the President said, accepted by both sides of the House; that by early in 1910 we had purchased the farm at Guelph; that in April, 1910, we moved up our first lot of eighteen or twenty prisoners, and proceeded at once to farm work, without lock or gun or prison garb; that in the course of a few weeks we took up another lot of fifteen, and later another and another and another, until the fall of 1910 found us with—in the neighborhood of a hundred and eighty men, and the record of their conduct altogether better than we could have hoped for; that the winter of 1910-11 saw teaching for a couple of hours a night established in the institution;—I can scarcely pass this point without adding that no more interesting sight have I witnessed than those men taking in that work with zest like that of so many children of school age;—that the summer of 1911 saw the population increased to 250, and the summer of 1912 to 325.

Now all this most of you know. You ask, how have the men been employed? From the very outset there has been more work than men. There were the lands to clear, the fields to cultivate, ditches to open, tile drains to put down, roads to build, bridges to construct, fences to build, temporary premises to erect, quarries to open, and with all this the work of the first summer not even begun.

This was followed by the construction of our lime-kiln, the installation of our lime-hydrator, the building of our brick and tile plant, the opening of our sand and gravel pit, the construction of our tramway for the transferring of our bulk material, the putting in of our temporary sewerage system,—the effluent from which will be as harmless as modern science can make it,—the putting in of our waterworks, the taking of stone from the quarries for lime and for building purposes, and for crushing for concrete and crushing for roads, the rough-dressing of our building stone,—and all this followed by the construction of our permanent buildings, all this as far as possible with our own material and with the work of the prisoners themselves. And there is still more work than men.

And this says nothing of the field crops, the hoe crops, the vegetable garden, the dairy, the hogs and the hens. There is a lot of useful work in growing 6,000 bushels of potatoes, as we did this year, 8,000 bushels of grain, 300 tons of ensilage, with 20 acres of mangels and turnips for upwards of 100

cattle, and enough table vegetables to meet not only our own requirements, but with considerable to spare for other institutions as well.

Our dairy is essentially our own,—our own material dug and quarried on the premises, with brick and tile manufactured by the men, with some of the best work I know of in the way of floor and manger construction, supervised by a prisoner who took as much interest in it as if it were his own. The methods of handling milk are the best approved. This dairy with its 80 cows takes the work of seven or eight prisoners. It is useful and instructive work for them. They are the better for it, and we are told by those who have had wide experience that if there is a better dairy anywhere it is unknown to them.

There is a lot of useful work in bringing 800 acres of land from what was generally a very crude and neglected state up to concert pitch. We hope in time to do it, and that the prisoners will do the work and see how it is done.

So much by way of review. What are we doing to-day, and what is the present reading of the barometer?

Let us leave Guelph for a while. We can come back to it again. Not all our prisoners are at Guelph, nor at Central Prison, Toronto.

We have a large northern and northwestern section of this Province of Ontario, a section the importance of which we are but coming to appreciate. I refer particularly now in connection with this work to the territory west of the Soo and on to Manitoba. In and about Fort William and Port Arthur there is a big population. In and about that territory there is much doing. In and about that territory there has been for some time past an average prison population of somewhere in the neighborhood of 65 or 70, with gaol accommodation for somewhere in the neighborhood of thirty. Now you can quite understand they would all come there to Fort William and Port Arthur. They are not bad young men, you know. They have been engaged in railway building west and east of Superior Junction, or on the transportation lines east and west on the lines tributary to Port Arthur. They come from the boats, the lumber camps, and the railway construction camps. They find their way into Fort William and Port Arthur. These prisoners are generally good types physically. But many a man from the railway or the lumber camp or the boat has found himself on the streets of Port Arthur or Fort William under arrest for something he has done,—with some whisky behind it as a rule—in fact 90 or 95 per cent. of the

cases are the result of whisky. The men come from the streets of Port Arthur and Fort William to the gaol, and there is an average prison population of 65, with accommodation for some 28 or 30 prisoners. They go through and serve out their term of two, three, four, or even ten months or a year. What is the result? It is only the long term men we could afford to bring to the Central Prison at Toronto, some eight hundred miles, or to the farm at Guelph, as it would mean an enormous expenditure in railway fare in comparison with the length of sentence involved, so much so that it will be found that our transportation account for years past has run into thousands of dollars *per* year, of course a bailiff has to be sent to bring a man down. So it is only in the case of long sentences that the Province can afford to bring prisoners so far.

Now when we took up the question of going out to the land with prisoners and ascertaining how far we could go in that direction, I went to the then Minister of Crown Lands, Hon. Mr. Cochrane, and talked it over. That was four or five years ago. I said to him: "If there is any land you can withdraw from settlement somewhere in the neighborhood of Fort William or Port Arthur, which has any agricultural possibilities, withdraw it, as much as you can." He was fortunate enough to find within six miles of Fort William some 1,000 acres of land, as good for agriculture as is to be found here in the County of York or anywhere else in the Province of Ontario, unlocated and still in the Crown, and it was withdrawn from settlement and location. What was the result? Having behind us the experience at Guelph, we went at the problem. These men in the gaol at Port Arthur were all or nearly all physically fit, and up to the mark for a day's work if properly fed. So on the 6th of June last we started out into the 1,000 acres of forest with a tent equipment for a working camp, with four men in charge. We took up soon twenty or so more, only to be followed by twenty or so more, until we early had fifty prisoners as our average population in that camp, on those thousand acres.

They set to work, and you know what that section is like, and what the work of clearing is like. But they went at it with a will, and stuck to it, and in the course of five or six days they not only chopped but stumped and cleaned up some five or six acres, which was immediately planted in turnips and potatoes, with the result that at the end of the season we took off practically enough for our own supply, and this year we grew several hundred bushels of roots of splendid quality

for our own use. But we went on—and we went up there with just four paid men. I give you that experience because it serves pretty well to illustrate. Let me tell you: there was an Assistant Warden, the general boss if you please; there was a man who took charge of the outside work, of chopping, logging, and clearing; there was a man we called the guard, his business being to keep a general supervision; and there was a cook. You can understand what that one guard would have to do, with forty-five or fifty men, spread over two or three hundred acres of land,—for we have 400 acres there. We did not have lock, handcuff or gun, or, for that matter, a house in which to put these men. We proceeded to build what we call our permanent premises, but they are simply a working camp,—with water supply, such drainage as will take care of our sewage, a storehouse to keep the vegetables from the frost, and sleeping accommodation, as sanitary as we can make it, as nearly so as we can possibly ask for.

What about the men themselves? We started them working, some stumping, some chopping, and some making roads, and in the six or seven months that have elapsed since the 6th of June, within record time after we took over the land and made preliminary preparations, they have cleared in that thousand acres somewhere in the neighborhood of 300 acres, chopped and windrowed it, and a great deal of it they have stumped too, and some of it is growing vegetables to-day. We have cut out roads all around and through that thousand acres where roads were surveyed,—all that with what might be considered unprofitable, prison work,—roads 66 feet wide, 20 feet of that stumped and cleared, as level as this table in the centre of the road, and you know what that will do for the community. Reduced to dollars, we expect that next year we shall have all the vegetables necessary and cheap,—from an agricultural standpoint, a thousand acres of cleared land within six miles of the city of Fort William, land which uncleared is worth about \$10 an acre, would be worth, if the estimates given me are correct, \$100 per acre in the market. What will that mean for the thousand acres? I confidently expect that in the course of the next twelve months, or eighteen months from the time we went up there, with very small cost to the Province, it will form an asset to the Province, from this unused labor, of sixty to seventy-five thousand dollars. What does that mean? We are doing not only something for the Province, but something for the men themselves,—a great deal, in fact. You ask, do the men run away? Occasionally. We have had some two hundred and some odd

go through our hands to date, and some three have got away, but let me ask you, is there any man in this audience or in this Province who, if this scheme is otherwise right, dares for one minute to condemn the scheme because one per cent. of the men fail to make good and live up to the trust reposed in them? (Applause.)

Let me give you some experiences. The men work, and give a percentage of efficiency, I am assured over and over again by those who have studied the subject, equal to any in the open market. There are fifty men there to-day, cutting roadways through the forest, cutting cordwood, chopping trees, stumping land, giving as much as we could buy from those same men at \$2 per day. I can well believe it, because I have seen them at work. These men go out of that institution; they have had good food, all the sunshine and fresh air there is, good beds to sleep on, and discipline throughout, for they are not permitted to go out and waste themselves and their means; they go out after two or three months looking and feeling fit to work; they are feeling fit, and they are anxious to go to work. Let me tell you some experiences we have had there with reference to that. It happens not infrequently at Fort William that a prisoner's time is out on Saturday morning; he will come to the manager, and say, "Sunday is a bad day to strike Port Arthur or Fort William looking for work; let me stay here till Monday." We never hesitate to let them do it. On the 23rd of December a man whose sentence expired that morning came and said, "If I work like the devil till the night of the 23rd, could I stay here till over Christmas? because I don't want to go to Port Arthur or Fort William on Christmas looking for work."

You will recall about a year or so ago now we obtained six hundred acres in the neighborhood of Whitby, with a view to transferring the Asylum there from Toronto. With the opening of spring there was much work to do. There was the farm work, which we did by hired labor. But there was a great deal to do in the way of construction, and we went to the Central Prison and selected some forty or fifty men, sent them down to Whitby, simply put them in farmhouses there, the dwellings vacated by the men from whom we purchased, and set them to work. We increased the number to fifty-five, then to sixty-five, and to-day there are seventy men there at Whitby. We put them to drainage construction, and the minute we got the plans for that institution we arranged not only for the drainage but for waterworks and sewerage.

There was grading to bring in the railway from the station at Whitby, a mile or so, in order to bring in and take out our material on the cars, so that instead of tearing horses, harness and wagons to pieces we will get our material on the car at the nearest possible point and carry it as far as we can. We started the men at putting in the waterworks and sewerage system, and at grading for the track, which has since been laid with rails by the Grand Trunk. They work every day, for ten hours a day, without complaint, and our average population is upwards of sixty-five. At Whitby there is not a gun, not a handcuff, not a lock on a gate, and while our average population has been sixty-five from early spring, the summer has come and gone, and this is winter to-day, not in a single instance has there been a violation of discipline. I want to say that that is very encouraging indeed.

What is the situation, then, to-day? We have fifty men in the open at Fort William, seventy men in the open at Whitby, three hundred and twenty men in the open at the institution at Guelph; that is, we have, all told, to-day, working in the open, working on three good meals a day, enjoying all the sunlight and fresh air there is, some four hundred and forty men, every one of whom, four or five years ago, would have been behind bars, serving out his prison sentence!

What is the future for those 320 men at Guelph? The future is work, work and more work, and lots more coming! What are we now doing? We have our carpenter shop, making windows, doors, door frames, trimmings, and everything that can be made for the Asylum which I hope we shall be able to begin building at Whitby in the early spring. We have our brick and tile yards, our concrete block construction, our lime kilns, our stone quarries, our stone crushers, all busy manufacturing and preparing material, a great deal of which will go into the Asylum at Whitby. That is the way we are utilizing the experience and labor at Guelph, so far as possible, in the proposed construction at Whitby. And so far as I can see there is work and lots of it in sight for years to come, productive work, work profitable to the men and profitable to the province.

Having said that much, just let me say with regard to another point or two, that our experience has been valuable, not so much from the standpoint of productive work from the standpoint of the Province; this is perhaps one of the least important phases of what has happened. It is now three or four years since we took up this work, and we have learned a great deal from the men themselves. We started with plans

for that institution drawn and prepared: those plans spelt "security," "security," all along the line. We had not gone far in our experience at Guelph till it dawned upon us that our greatest danger was in the security we were providing, that the danger in connection with this whole proposition lay in the security we were providing in the plans; and we have from that day to this altered from time to time those plans as far as the stage of construction would permit, and we shall continue to alter them, always in the direction of further liberty for the men. I don't pretend to say that we have solved the problem completely. Dr. Gilmour and I have talked over that problem and particularly over one aspect of it which is not yet solved: and that is, when we get through our construction—for we have altered again and again our plans in that direction,—shall we require prison walls around that institution at all? That question still remains unanswered. I don't know what the answer will be. I think a prison wall about that institution will be about the last thing to be constructed; the rest will be pretty well advanced before that. Let me say, we have not started out with any system or plan cut and dried. We do not claim too much. Sometimes I think that is the only conclusion people who do not know would come to, but anyone who could see and feel what is going on there would feel that the story to tell is not one of the outcome of any system devised or of any plans thought out; it is a matter of necessity, of development, and as far as I can see a matter of atmosphere created by the men themselves.

If I might mention names, there are two men to whom this is largely due: one of them sits here to-day, Dr. Gilmour; the other is Mr. Armstrong, my Deputy. (Applause.) These officials, and the officials under them, have created an atmosphere, that is calculated to inspire the confidence of the employees and of the men themselves, that tells to the men every day that what is just and right these officials will do. (Applause.)

(January 20th, 1913.)

Scientific Management.

BY MR. FREDERICK WINSLOW TAYLOR.*

AT a special evening meeting of the Canadian Club held on Monday, the 20th January, 1913, Mr. Frederick Winslow Taylor, of Philadelphia, said:

Gentlemen,—I am going to talk to you to-night a good deal about working men, and in what I have to say I have in mind merely that class of working men who are engaged in what may be called co-operative industries. I do not refer, for instance, to a coachman, who works by himself, but merely to men who work in certain groups, whose interests are common, and are therefore closely dependent upon one another. It is important to bear this in mind, because generalizations apply to all classes of working men, and allowance must be made for some very sweeping statements.

My subject will be the Principles of Scientific Management, and most of my facts relate to working men in this country. The average man believes it for his best interest to go slow, instead of going fast, to turn out as little work as possible, instead of as much as possible. Now that firm conviction, that it is for the interest of the working man to restrict output, is practically universal among working men. It is due to two principal causes, and I think I may say that for neither of these causes is the working man principally to blame; as I am going to try to show you, I think men of our class are much more to blame than the working men for the existence of these two very fallacious ideas.

The first of these causes is this: you have in Toronto a certain number of men working in a trade, and if you suggest that it would be to their interest to double the output by each man becoming more efficient or in any other way, there would not be a shadow of doubt in their minds that the only result would be to throw half of them out of work. For the average working man this is a self-evident fact, it does not demand argument, it is axiomatic, he would only laugh at anyone who would say anything else. Strangely enough, I find that the great majority, yes, four-fifths, of educated

* Mr. Frederick Winslow Taylor of Philadelphia is one of the founders of the Scientific Management movement, and is the author of several text books on the subject.

men, who read and study this subject, have the same idea, that to increase output would result in throwing a whole lot of men out of employment. Now this, as I say, is a self-evident proposition to the working men. Their labor leaders—there is hardly one of them throughout the country but is teaching them that it is to their interest to restrict output. There is hardly a labor union but has enacted legislation tending to this directly, or is contemplating it. And while this is the generally inherited principle, coming to them from the time they are small boys, and imbibed from everyone talking about it, yet there never has been a greater fallacy than this! To prove this, all that is necessary to do is to go back and look at the history of any trade, I don't care what, and you will find the directly opposite to be true: that any device or scheme to increase output, instead of throwing men out of work, has made more work for the men in that trade. There is one industry in which that is not true, viz., agriculture, the only one that I know of. In agriculture, during the past eighty years, the number of men engaged, in the United States, has been reduced from 80 per cent. to 35 per cent.; that of course is due to the introduction of labor-saving machinery; and the reason for that is that while we can eat a great variety of food we cannot eat much more food than the last generation, though perhaps the waste is greater. But that furnishes the only exception I know of any large industry in which an increase of output has not resulted in making more work for the men in that trade instead of less.

We have one instance before us, over which the fight was quite recent, I have no doubt you have observed it,—the case of the linotype and monotype composing machines. It was a fight at first to get them introduced, but now you won't find a union but will admit that there is work for far more men than before the machines were introduced. This is simply an illustration of this belief that is so ingrained in the working men. However, the real meaning of this phenomenon can be appreciated only by taking one of the older trades, as the linotype and monotype ideas are too recently introduced to be startling in their statistics. But take any old trade, the cotton industry, for instance. You remember, perhaps, the riots and labor disturbances in Manchester, England, when the old hand loom was being superseded by the power loom. The power loom was invented about 1780 or 1790, but did not come into general use till about twenty-five years later; but between the years 1825 and 1840 the power loom gradually was superseding the hand loom, and about 1840 things came to a climax,

and the weavers of Manchester, who knew all about what the power loom would do, realized that while there were five thousand of them then working at the hand looms in Manchester, when the power loom was really installed, there would be only fifteen hundred of them left. Now, gentlemen, I am not defending arson and murder, or any violence on the part of the unions, but we shall have to have a little charity in judging those men and their actions under those circumstances: they did just what you or I would do; we would not murder, or smash machines, or burn down establishments, but if any device or scheme were introduced which would throw two-thirds of us completely out of our trades—(and you must remember that those trades were almost closed,—they had cause to feel a grievance), and if you will put yourselves in the places of those weavers of 1840 you will have to look upon them a little more charitably than if you just look at the fact that when the machines were brought in they smashed them up, burned down the factories, and beat up the men operating them. They did everything in their power to prevent the power loom from coming in. And just note the effect of it. It had practically no effect! The power loom came along; I doubt if it was stayed a day by it. And more people are employed through it to-day than ever before.

That is almost the universal result of any device to increase output. And in spite of the opposition which scientific management is receiving it is coming. It has the opposition of the trades unions, the opposition of well-meaning philanthropists who have believed the lies spread abroad by the unions, the opposition of public opinion misguided by those who are talking against it, but it has never been delayed and it never will be, because any device for increasing human efficiency—and the history of all such devices is exactly the same—cannot be stopped by any opposition.

Now let us see what happened in Manchester, England, because it is typical: just what is happening all over the world, and will happen. It did throw men out of employment: there were five thousand cotton weavers previous to the introduction of the power loom; but in Manchester now there are two hundred and sixty-five thousand cotton operatives, as against five thousand! And each man is now averaging ten yards of cloth at the very least where each man formerly averaged one yard of cloth! And the population of England has not more than doubled in that time, but we will say it has trebled, just for argument's sake—and that five yards of cloth is going out of Manchester now where one yard went out in 1840: now

what is the real, fundamental meaning of this? There is something back of it, something far more important than efficiency or the market that it gives, one of the most important facts in this world, and that is, broadly speaking, and of course with certain limitations, that all you have to do is to bring wealth into this world and the world uses it; that is the fundamental fact. I speak now of things worth while, things that can be used by the people at large, not of luxuries, but outside of food—we cannot increase the use of food much—all you have to do is to bring wealth into the world, and the world will use it. What really happened in 1840 was that cotton goods, from being a luxury to be worn only by the rich, now came to be worn by every man, woman and child, and were believed a necessary, not a luxury,—even in the uncivilized world to-day, it is used.

Of course we know that it is necessary to restrict output; that the statement I have made is not absolutely, literally, true: we know wealth must be brought in in fairly even balance: if, for example, there is an increase in cotton goods without proportionate increase in other things, the world gets out of kilter in one direction. So there must be restriction of output in that respect, for a few years to come, all over the world, not in only one country, if we get going too fast, and there are more new undertakings than there is liquidated capital for. If we do not restrict output then we have a diseased condition of over-production, for a long time sometimes; but that nowhere justifies restriction of output on the part of any man or set of men, either manufacturers or working men, for any other reason. There could be no greater crime against humanity than this of restriction of output. The wealth of the world comes from only two sources: it comes from the ground, or is what man produces. All you do in restricting output is to cut off people from getting some of the means of progress of the world, and from increasing the use of things in the world.

And let me call your attention right here to another very important fact connected with this: that the working people of the world, the philanthropists of the world, and a great part of the thinking people of the world who are studying new problems, are coming to the conclusion that the working man is not getting anything like his share of the joint product of capital and labor, that capital is getting far too great a share; and I myself sympathize with this very largely. In the ordinary operation of our large trusts the working man does not get anything like his fair share. This becomes so

conspicuous, so prominent, that we are inclined to generalize and draw very broad conclusions. In the July "Atlantic Monthly" was an article by Mr. Norman Fay, who showed by the last census returns in the United States very conclusively that if the working people of the United States got an equal division of the property now belonging to the capital of the United States, they would get just thirteen cents per man per day more than they are now getting. Now what working man would be satisfied, even if he had an equal division, when that is all he would get? He imagines he would get four or five dollars a day more! That is startling. I had some faint notion the working man was wrong, but when you get statistics on a large scale you see how little chance there is for the working man to gain by an equal division of wealth. I am sufficiently progressive to believe that there is great injustice going on; but that the great hope of the working man lies there—most certainly not! It is a great deal worse in England in the matter of restriction of output. The Liberal party in England,—and I think if I were there I would be among that Liberal party,—are all engaged in a general scheme of taking from the rich people to hand over to the poor. Much of this I approve of, but a great deal of it I don't; much of it will tend to pauperize. But if they take it all away from the rich, supposing the same proportions held as in the United States, they would all get just thirteen cents a day more; that is not much to live for or to hope for! Whereas by increasing the output they would profit much more than that.

It is of great advantage to be able to go back, for confirmation of this, to a time not so very long ago, when a week's work was a fair exchange for a bushel of wheat. There is no more fallacious way of treating this part of economics than that of talking about wages: wages tell you next to nothing; wages might be a certain amount so many years ago, but it was the same in every part of the country; but statistics tell you that a few years ago a week's work purchased a bushel of wheat; now what man would be content to trade his week's work for ten bushels of wheat? He would hardly do it.

Now I am talking so long about this restriction of output, because it lies right at the root of scientific management. That is the chief source of the opposition of a great many thinking men, and practically all labor men, because scientific management has for its object the increasing of the output of every man. Yet, I repeat, the working men of the country are hardly to blame for this fallacy. I ask you gentlemen, has anyone ever spoken to you here in Toronto

against this? They are all in favor of restricting output. If we, who ought to know better, who have a fine opportunity of reading history, do not tell them differently and educate our working men along this line, those who have not leisure to read up on this matter cannot be expected to have any other view. If you have anyone talking along this line here in Toronto, you are the first city I have met with that has.

Now the second cause of the firm belief on the part of the working man that it pays him to go slow instead of going fast—and the working man is in no way to blame for this either—we will next see.

If you were manufacturing, for instance, an article of that sort, (a fountain pen), we will assume that it can be made by one man, and we will assume that a man is on the average making ten a day, and that he is making \$2.50 a day throughout the year. If that man has a good foreman, he would say, "I think you would do better if you would make this pen by the piece, instead of by day work; and I will give you 10 cents apiece for the parts you make of 25 pens in a day." The working man is sure, of course, that in the course of the year, through his own ingenuity, through the help of his foreman, through talking to his friends about his work, and through working harder, he would find himself turning out 20 pieces instead of 10 whole pens in a day, and so would find himself earning \$5 a day instead of \$2.50. His foreman, if he is any kind of a man, would be pretty well satisfied with that: the man would be earning pretty high wages, and the company would be earning twice as much, because it would be turning out twice as many pens with the same plant and the same appliances. He should feel very well satisfied. But let us see whether we give the man that \$5. The employer, or the Board of Directors, sends for the payroll. I am not blaming anyone for this: I am merely stating facts; and it is our duty, everyone of us, nowadays, to ask for the payroll, and see what our men are getting. I think I may say to our horror we see that our machinist is getting \$5 a day, while a little while ago he was receiving only \$2.50 a day. We feel this is a pretty serious matter, and it is almost the universal view that we can't afford this, that we are ruining our labor market. So the superintendent is sent for, or the foreman, and told in no doubtful way that he can't afford to ruin our labor market. If he is a risky man, the chances are he will cut that fellow down, so he won't earn more than \$2.75 a day. Now there has a great deal been said in the past few years about the meanness of the working people, their degeneracy, and the

fact that they do become, in many cases, almost the scum of their country through their heartlessness and their greed. My experience has been, and I have had pretty wide experience of the working people, that man for man they are just about the same in character and integrity as the average man in the community, neither better nor worse. In a case where men are in a state of war we see them at their worst; but whether we look upon them as mean and heartless or not, there is just one thing the working men of our country are not—they are not fools! And it does not take more than one act like that, just one little object lesson like that, to make a working man "soldier" for the rest of his career. From that time forward, he says: "\$2.75 a day is the most these fellows will pay me, so \$2.75 is what I will earn and never turn out a single piece more." These are the principles of piece workers in the United States, and I have no doubt in Canada too. It is a miserable policy for themselves; they would do better to swallow their anger and go ahead; but their anger is so great that you can't blame them for restricting the output. That is the great reason for "soldiering." They must keep their employers ignorant of what they can do. Some people do not know what that word means. If you have seen a regiment drilling, —the men are told to raise their right foot, and they do so; then their left foot, and they raise it; so the drill sergeant gets them all working, but going nowhere—that is "soldiering!" (Laughter.) That is what working men in the United States do universally; and it is enormously worse in England! Every time they had to get an increase in work, the remedy was to go still slower. That is the cause of the poverty and the great unrest of England, through this "soldiering," this terrific restriction of output, turning out less things. They have just one-half of the trade with the outside world and with each other that they might have; and that means poverty!

Now, gentlemen, I have not gotten very far. I want to begin to talk about scientific management. (Laughter.) But my excuse is that this strikes at the root of it, and this part of it is not generally understood at all.

I think I may say here that scientific management had its origin, and that the very first step that was taken toward the development of what came to be known as scientific management was taken, in an earnest endeavor to remedy the evils of this "soldiering."

It was after a long piecework fight with the working men of the Midvale Steel Works, an intensely mean, disreputable

and disgraceful fight it was too, that an effort was made to correct this evil of soldiering. And I want to emphasize this statement, that every subsequent step taken in scientific management was taken in an equally earnest endeavor to remedy the palpable defects existing in the former kind of management.

A great many people have the idea that it is a kind of theory evolved by someone having tried it. This is not so. For thirty years scientific management has been in daily and successful use, but no one ever bothered to analyze it till within the last eight or nine years. It simply was an evolution taken step by step to correct the evils that were right before the men who did it; an evolution in which a great many men had their part. And it is to grow in area and to be worked out through the co-operation of many men. I emphasize this, because those of you who have had to do with engineering inventions know that as to new ideas the more you see of them the more suspicious you are. As an engineer myself, and a rather radical one, I have become profoundly suspicious of my own ideas, and more so of those of anybody else; in other words, if a new thing is tried, it may be better, but ninety-nine times out of a hundred it may be worse than before. Most men must have arrived at this same conclusion. What I want to emphasize is, that scientific management is not in that category: it is an evolution, not an invention; it has stood severe tests again and again; it has been tried by the worst kind of critics, those who were looking for dollars, and unless the dollars came they would not have anything to do with it.

About fifty thousand men were working under it in the United States a few years ago; now perhaps there are three times as many. It is very difficult to get statistics, because it is spreading in so many ways; but for those companies which have got under scientific management it is conservative to say that the output of the average man has been doubled. This has resulted in lowering the cost price of the articles produced, therefore giving larger profit to the company. Also, in many cases, when that has gone on long enough, it results in lowering the selling price, and in that way the general public has got the benefit of scientific management.

Now this is a pretty broad assertion, that scientific management has doubled the output per man, but in the sworn testimony taken before the House Committee last year, amongst a mass of testimony, covering more than two thousand pages, given subject to cross-examination, and verified

by members of this committee, I want to give you one of the small buried facts, about one of our establishments under scientific management. Members of the committee went to verify it. In this establishment the output had been trebled; this was with the same number of men, turning out three times as much as their former output. It had been asserted by labor leaders of this particular establishment that it had lowered the wages of the working men; but statistics presented to the committee in that regard showed that for all those workmen who had been working more than one year in the establishment, including even the colored laborers who simply moved the pieces on the floor, the men who swept, the janitor, every boy and man, and the skilled labor and unskilled alike, the average man was receiving seventy-three and a fraction per cent. higher wages than when he came to the company. And the selling price of the goods produced by this establishment had been lowered 25 per cent., so that the general public got the benefit of that. From having had a strike just about six months before the introduction of that system, the men had become so devoted to their employers that it was utterly inconceivable that there ever would be a strike again! As proof of that, during the street car riots, all the trades were called upon to go out on a sympathetic strike, and the men in one immense establishment near this one went out; so did the men in three others; but in the establishment under scientific management only one man went out, and he had been employed only fifteen days, and had not had time to get into the spirit of the company. Now that is a fair round-up of what takes place under scientific management.

Again, let me give you a case. I want to convince you gentlemen that what I am talking about is not theory, but can be verified by statistics, and is not loose talk. Only within the past four days, at Watertown Arsenal, Gen. Crozier gave statistics up to last June, showing that the men in that arsenal, doing not repeat work but all new work,—it is hard to find subjects of comparison, but he found some eighty or a hundred articles that were made last year and this year, and the workmen struck for only four days, because of the very foolish way of dealing with them—averaged 29 per cent. higher wages, and were turning out two and a half times as much work as before; and the Arsenal had saved that year \$363,000. No Chief of Ordnance or other public official would dare to give those figures unless they were true.

To show you that I understate the matter, in saying that the average establishment when put under scientific manage-

ment will turn out twice as much per man, while more good comes to the manufacturer,—I am perfectly free to say that I am not interested in that, so much so that it occupies my whole time and I give all my spare money to the cause, because it is the cause of the working man. A few stockholders benefit by it; and I am glad of that; but who would spend his life for a few stockholders? Not I! I have something else to do! The workingman, in my judgment, gets far more out of it than the stockholders. If the average increase is from 37 to 100 per cent. in wages, surely that is a good thing for the boys; and automatically their wages do go up. If a brother goes there into that establishment, and in three days gets an increase, they understand his talk. And that is well worth while for the working men, while this stimulus given to the workman makes the man gradually come to look upon his employer as the best friend in the world. The old idea was that your employer, though he might be a personal friend, was at least your tactical enemy, and in general a person who would bear a large amount of watching. This great change from enmity to friendship is the greatest good that comes to the working man.

Scientific management has been used in a great range of industries; there is hardly a type of industry in which it has not been introduced in the past thirty years. Nineteen out of twenty of them have been severely competitive industries, such as the steel and cotton industries. There has never been but this one strike, and then it was thoroughly unjustified. A week or so ago I went to see those moulders—you couldn't drive them back to the old system with a club; and they are all union men! The unions have been trying to bring them back; but of all the men employed at the Watertown Arsenal just three men attended the last call to a union meeting.

Now, what is scientific management? I think I can clearly describe it somewhat by pointing out what it is not, because there are very great misapprehensions about it. Scientific management is not any efficiency device of any kind, or is it any group of efficiency devices. For example, it is no new scheme of figuring costs; it is not having buying men, or a buying system; it is not a differential rate; or piece work; it is not studying masses of men, or time system, with functional or divided foremanship; it is not printing or unloading a ton or two of blanks upon a company, and saying, "There's your system; use it!" (Laughter.) I am not sneering at efficiency devices. I have great respect for every one of them, except for the one with a ton or two of blanks! I have respect

for cost systems, and for buying systems; and for the application of time study on a large scale to industries. New time study is being used in a great many establishments running under scientific management, but scientific management is more, far more enduring, and of far greater importance, of an importance far more serious than mere devices. These devices will everyone be superseded by something better in a few years; but the great broad principles of scientific management, I feel, have come to stay.

Scientific management cannot exist, and does not exist, till there is a complete mental revolution on the part of the working man as to his attitude towards those who employ him, and his whole outlook on the trade; and it does not exist until there is an equally complete mental revolution on the part of the employers and those on the management side. I dare say that is very blind to you, but I hope before the evening is done to make it clear to you; at least to make plain this mental change on both sides, so you will have no doubt of what I mean.

But let me call your attention to one thing. If you are manufacturing, say, an article of that sort (a fork). Into the cost of that article goes a certain amount of raw material, and aside from that, what are called variously "overhead expenses," "general expenses," or "indirect expenses," such as taxes, insurance, depreciation, salaries of the higher officers, sales expenses, stores and supplies. You have to add its proper share of these general expenses. If you will add the cost of materials and the proper proportion of general expenses, you have the total cost price of the article, and if you subtract that from the selling price you have what is called the surplus. And it is over the division of this surplus that almost all the quarrels of capital and labor have been. The workman wants what he thinks just and right as payable in wages, and the employer wants his share in dividends. And it is over the division of this surplus that the great wars of the past have been waged between capital and labor. Now the new mental outlook that comes to both sides under scientific management is, that both sides come very soon to realize that if they stop pulling apart, look at the division of this surplus in wages to the workman and dividend to the employer, and both push together as hard as possible in the same direction, they can make that surplus so large that there is no occasion for any quarrel over its division: labor gets an immense increase in wages, and still leaves a large share for capital. That is a great change, from looking upon the division, which means

war, to turning and making the surplus so large that there is no occasion for war.

As an illustration of what is taking place all along the line, I want to try to make clear to you what this change is, and that it is not an invention or a device, I think it will make it clearer if I compare conditions under it with the older types of management, for a company of say five hundred or a thousand men. The men of these trades have learned practically all they know about them by themselves watching others at work. They have been taught next to nothing and have learned next to nothing. They learn trades now just as they did in the middle ages, by watching the men around them, and accepting what has been handed down by tradition from time immemorial. When I served my two apprenticeships, as a patternmaker and as a machinist, I think two and a half hours covered the reading I did; and I had the advantage over some of the boys because I had entered college, and read a little easier than the rest. No one studied the trade from books. I presented my own boy with a fine collection of books on the machinist trade, but I never saw him open one. There was some excuse for him, though, for he got up at five o'clock in the morning, and cooked his own breakfast, and did not get back home till seven o'clock at night. So I don't regret his not reading. But I watched him to see if boys were learning trades better than I did; my impression is that things are just the same.

In spite of this fact, that trades are learned now little better than they used to be long ago, his trade still continues the greatest possession of every workman, of every mechanic, his greatest asset, his capital; and any employer who knows anything about his business, any manager who knows about his business, knows that the first thing is to get the true initiative of his workman. I mean, that man's hardest work, his ingenuity, his determination to do the best he can for his employer, his well wishing towards his employer, his talking and doing everything he can to serve his employer's interests. How far they fall short of it! Those of us who were working men did just as little as we could, to make that man think we were doing a day's work. There are a few employers, one in thirty, or forty, or fifty perhaps, though I doubt if there are more than one in a hundred, who deliberately set out to pay their men more than the competitive rate around. That represents the highest type of employer; because in the long run, if he keeps it up long enough and just has gone ahead in full sight of the men and of the community, so they will know there is

no trick behind it, they will respond by giving him their best output. Under scientific management the best output of that man is increased. There are a few of those employers.

It is the employer who gets the best initiative of his men whom I want to contrast with scientific management. Even with that highest type of manufacturer, while there will be a growth of output under the old system, there is not the slightest hope of that man competing with scientific management, because under scientific management the initiative of every workman is obtained with absolute regularity, because the workmen invariably work hard and give their ingenuity and best thought; there is nothing spasmodic about it, it does not depend upon public opinion. This is not accomplished at once, because it takes from two to five years to introduce scientific management, and no man, whether a faker or anything else, can do anything for you in less, but while it is coming in, and after they have come under it, the stimulus of two kinds operates: one is the new and absolutely unheard-of unloading of a large part of the work, and the duties of this kind voluntarily assumed by the men on the management side; this produces a far greater effect in increasing the output and diminishing the cost of the article produced, with the initiative of the workmen.

These new burdens and duties assumed by the management fall into four large groups, called the principles of scientific management, and it is with these new duties or principles that I want to deal. I have got there at last; it has taken me a long time! (Laughter.)

The first of these new duties, is the gathering in of that great mass of traditional knowledge which in the past has been in the heads of the working men, as a knack or habit, regarding it, tabulating it, and in almost all cases reducing it to laws, rules, in many cases to mathematical formulae, in place of rule-of-thumb; this science and exact knowledge diffused through the mass of workmen produces an enormous increase in the daily output of the workmen.

The second of the principles of scientific management is, the scientific study and selection of each workman in the place, with a view to the progressive development of that workman. I say both the study and the development of the workman are progressive. It becomes the duty of each manufacturer to study every workman just as thoroughly as in the past it was his duty to study each one of his machines. Every one of us in the past has had that duty for years to study machines, but this new principle demands the careful, detailed study of every

workman in the place, to find in the first place all about the man's capacity, his weak places and his strong points, what the man can be developed into, and then the deliberately setting out to train each man so that ultimately he will be doing higher and more profitable work.

The third principle is, bringing the scientifically trained and selected workmen and science together. I say "bringing"—that has a stiff, hard sound to your trade union man, but there is so very little of it that he has done; the management has done a little of it. But I say deliberately, making the workman work in the cause of the science. That can be done, when they realize that nine-tenths of the trouble in bringing over from the old management to the new lies in making the management do its share of the new duties; there is little trouble with the workmen, but there is never-ending trouble to make the men on the management side change his ways. It has a very curious effect sometimes, when you try to introduce the new management. You go to the man, and suggest something. "Oh, no, I don't want this," he will say, "nor that, I want that other department looked into, it is very poorly managed by that man, you had better change his ways." Artemus Ward expressed the feeling of the average man on the management side very accurately when he said he was "ready to sacrifice his wife's relations to any extent on the altar of freedom!" (Laughter.)

The fourth of the principles of scientific management is perhaps the blindest, the least obvious of all these principles, and unless one has almost worked in the establishment, he can hardly realize its importance. The fourth of the principles lies in the fact, that under this new scheme, the work which was originally done all by the workman is divided into two great groups, and one of these is turned over, deliberately turned over, to the men on the management side. A great slice of it is handed over,—so great is this slice of the work that I am sure you will feel astonished and maybe horrified when I tell you that in a well run establishment doing miscellaneous work there will be one man on the management side to every three workmen!

Now, gentlemen, again let me remind you, that this is no theory. I know what you are saying to yourselves: "no establishment can live with all this overhead expense; it is a waste of labor, non-productive." But let me remind you, that these establishments that started and have gone under it are all more prosperous than their competitors; there is no exception; those companies in which they have one man on the

management side to every three workmen are making vastly more money than under the old system. Don't get theory mixed up with your facts!

Under this great division of labor, it is due to that principle more than to any other that there has never been a strike under scientific management; because you have there team work, and of the highest order. This is literally true: in the establishment I spoke of, a machine shop, hardly an act on the part of a workman is not preceded by an act on the part of some one of the management; that involves not only co-operation but co-operative team work of a very high order. Instead of one man doing a job on a lathe or a planer, perhaps eighteen men are doing a little bit each for that one job. When men came to realize that it means earning 33 to 100 per cent. more than without that team work they can possibly earn, that makes for friendship. The old idea of master and man has entirely disappeared. It is literally true, that the work becomes so much of a democracy, that the complaints on the part of the workmen that some man on the management side has failed to do his part are vastly more numerous than those on the part of the management against the men for not doing their part. That is democracy! It is pretty hard for a manager to have a man come in and "cuss him out," and the workman doesn't hesitate to do it for one minute! Now you may talk or laugh about it if you like, but it is a great revolution. You can't have a fight among men on the same team. When both sides realize that neither one can work without the other, they won't fight. You will have lots of scraps when it is coming in, but when they are once co-operating and see the benefits of it, then you have no further squabbles. I don't mean to say that workman will stop grouching,—for gracious sakes no! it would be a very unhappy state if he could not; or that the manager will never cuss any more; but grouching and cussing do not indicate that you are not the very best of friends; you can complain to each other all you want, and sass each other, and be pretty good friends.

Now, I believe I have finished with the theory of scientific management. And I want to try to convince you of the value of scientific management, that it is not in mere theory, but I will give you some samples, some concrete illustrations of how it works, and will tell you several stories of how these four principles are applied.

Let me go over the four principles again: the first is the development of science to replace the old rule-of-thumb that was in the heads of the workmen; the second, the scientific

study and selection and the progressive development of the workmen; the third, the bringing these together; and the fourth, the equal division of work between workmen and management.

I am quite sure you will find in the stories I am going to tell you much to criticize and perhaps to complain of, but I hope you will not forget to look for these four principles, because it is the application of these principles I want to illustrate. While something else may strike you as interesting, please look for the application of the principles, because that is what produces the results.

I ordinarily begin by showing the application of these principles to pig iron handling, because that is a most elementary form of human effort: a man steps up, takes a piece of iron, without any other implement than his hands, walks a few steps, and drops it on a pile. I can see you smile when I say there is science in handling pig iron, a science so great that no workmen can understand it! The story is too long; there are others shorter and quite as effective, because what I want to do is to begin with the most elementary form of human effort, and gradually go up the scale to the more difficult, showing the application of these principles to the most elaborate trade that is known; it is only by a series of object lessons of this sort that I can convince you of the value of scientific management, and that the older management cannot compete with it.

The first illustration will be that of shoveling. I dare say you men will smile when I say there is a big science in shoveling, not a small science but a big one. I say it without hesitation; for if any of you men were to place before yourself a stunt of digging, you would be developing the science of it; you would be on the track of studying a great many elements in the science, for it is certainly of the most important. I want to show you what this most important element is, and let you see how far-reaching in its consequences it is when it becomes the duty of the management to tell the workman how to do his work, how far-reaching even in very elementary work. When I first went to the Bethlehem Steel Company I saw those big, powerful shovelers, so devoted to the profession that they would not let the company furnish the shovels, they wanted something just suited to their work. I saw them go to the car of coal—the company was using rice coal—and unload that car with a load of $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{3}{4}$ pounds of coal per shovel load. These same men then went to work to handle Mesaba ore, and did it with 38 and a fraction pounds to the

shovel! It does not take very profound reasoning to conclude that either the $3\frac{1}{2}$ pound load or the 38 pound load was wrong. A man could not do his largest possible work with both loads; that is perfectly evident, it does not require any argument. Now I want to show you the different mental attitude. Under the old form of management you would send for the manager, and ask him what was the proper load for a shovel; and if he knew his trade, he would be startled, maybe, but he would give you some answer. Under scientific management you never ask a man anything, you have to know facts from your own investigation; there is no authority, you have to know the facts from scientific inquiry of your own. It becomes the duty, under scientific management, to investigate. What we did was to send for two big, powerful shovelers, well suited for their work, good hard-working fellows, call them into the office, and say, "Now, Pat and Mike, we are going to ask you to do a whole lot of fool things, and a young chap with a board and pencil is going to make notes of what you do. We would like you to do this, but we want you to understand that this is no joke; we propose paying you fellows double wages all the time this thing is going on, but in return we want to warn you, if you throw any of your monkey business of any kind you will go over the fence, and that right off; there is to be no nonsense about it. Do just what these fellows tell you, or let it alone; they will be onto you, and they have orders to throw you over the fence; take it or leave it as you please." They take it, and I find they are just as square as any other fellows too.

And let me tell you, labor leaders to the contrary notwithstanding, it is no part of scientific management to overwork any man, or to underwork any man. Of course there are mistakes made; occasionally we demand too severe tasks from men; but all they ever have to do is to point it out; if they do too little it is up to us to find that out! The characteristic of all our establishments is a tendency to underworking. They don't loaf, but they don't hurry; we don't allow them to hurry, it makes too much nervous strain. All the work is done evenly, but every false movement is cut out, every slow movement is cut out; this is how we get our game.

We first started that experiment with a very heavy lift, perhaps 38 pounds, we will say it was so much. Then we cut that shovel off. We counted the number of shovel loads per day the men handled, and weighed the whole tonnage shoveled in a day, so we found out the average weight of each shovelful. We found that in three or four days they would

average a little over 38 pounds to the shovel, and we will say they shoveled a pile that high. Then we cut off the shovel, so that it would hold 34 pounds; immediately the tonnage went up. Again we cut an inch or so off the shovel, so it now held 30 pounds, and so on, to 26 pounds, and at 21½ pounds the tonnage shoveled reached its maximum. At 18 pounds it fell down, at 14 it fell away down, at 12 and at 10 it fell lower than at 28! So we found that a shoveler well suited to his work will do his biggest day's work with a load of 21 pounds or thereabouts to the shovel. Don't take this too literally: I don't mean that any shovelers will take 21 pounds, but that is the average. All this work is not an exact science, it is not mathematics, but it is the best approximation you can get to it.

Those men had all owned their own shovels, but when we started this experiment we furnished the shovels, so we had to build a large tool room at the Bethlehem Steel Company's works, and equip them with different implements for the sand, the ashes, the ore, the spiegel, all the various materials used in the steel works. They had to have an implement to hold about 21½ pounds. In order to know what each gang of four or six men could do, they had to measure each man's work, so as to get to an individual basis. We made it a rule that no man should work in that gang who could not earn 60 per cent. higher wages than any others, so it became necessary to measure and compute a great deal. That meant a large labor office, with clerks, and men who play chess with those four or six young men on a large map of the works, for they were spread over land two miles long, and one and a half wide. We had to devise methods of measuring up all the work. I am trying to show you how far-reaching the effects of this one element of scientific shoveling were. Each man on coming in in the morning took one of two pieces of pasteboard; if it was white, he was all right; but if it was yellow that meant that he had fallen below 60 per cent. ahead of other men, and he could not stay in that gang long unless he improved. When a man would get four or five or six yellow slips in succession, a man would go from the office, a teacher, to talk to him about it. Under the old way, a man like that would be sent for, and told, "You are no good: get out of this." I have heard that said by labor foremen many a time. But this is what takes place under scientific management: a teacher goes down, and says, "Here, Mike, something has gone wrong with you: you have had four or five of these yellow slips. Are you sick? What has happened to you? If you are, we will try to give you an easier job. That's what I

have come down to talk to you about. You look like a mighty good workman, and a fine shoveler. I have showed you how to do the work. If you don't know how to shovel, we will show you. Have you forgotten?" There is a good deal of science in shoveling: if you are going to push your shovel into the heap of sand or ore with your arms you are not doing it the best way and you will soon get tired. You should put your shovel handle against your right hip, and throw your body forward, then draw back and throw the shovelful. Particularly in the steel works the material is a good deal tangled up, and that one thing counts for a good deal; a man shoving his shovel in with his arm gets tired far more quickly, and does not do so much work. I want to make it clear to you that there is a new mental attitude: if a workman goes wrong, that is our fault on the management side, not his; we have failed to teach him how to work right. Of course there are loafers, many of them, but you can redeem about four out of five if you keep at them long enough. There are some incorrigibles, and there is no place for them under scientific management.

A question that is vital is, does this thing pay? I have outlined the average amount of work it entails. At the Bethlehem works they have a tool room; they have two or three college men who for three years have devoted their whole time to studying the movements of the workmen; they had to pay the salaries of these men; they had to have clerks in the tool room; they had to have a telephone system, and a messenger system, and teachers. There was a whole lot of night work that had to be done, to be able to tell those fellows the work for the next day. But scientific management has absolutely nothing to do with philanthropy: if it does not pay a great deal better than the old system there is nothing to it, and no system which hinges on philanthropy is worth anything.

Does it pay? In the past three years, at the Bethlehem Steel Works, when they all came under it, all the work had been studied, and all the mechanism was ready to be put in operation, we were ready to test it. We fortunately had records at the Bethlehem Steel Works of the cost of materials under the old system of management, and we had several million tons of ore that would be handled in a year; under the old system it cost at least between 7 and 8 cents a ton. Those of you who are accustomed to the business know that the cost of handling such materials on the average railroad is from 8 to 10 cents a ton. But we found that after adding

the cost of all these things I have mentioned, the new cost of handling a ton of material was between 3 and 4 cents! So that during the last six months there was a saving by the Bethlehem Steel Co. of between \$75,000 and \$80,000 a year. That is what the Steel Works got out of scientific management! What did the men get out of it? We made very careful investigations. The number of workmen doing a certain work was reduced from four to six hundred to a hundred and forty men. They are receiving some 60 per cent. higher wages than before. We found only two men among them to be drinking men. They were saving money most of them where before they spent almost all; they were living well, and were vastly more contented than before. And always we have lots of men wanting to get onto that gang. There is never a time but there are forty or fifty men wanting to get on that gang, to see if they are higher-priced men or not. That justifies the method of scientific management, those two facts, and nothing other than that will justify it. Any scheme which makes more money for the manufacturer and doesn't make any more money for the workingman is a rotten scheme! And any scheme which makes more money for the workman and not for the manufacturer is also a rotten scheme. It has to be mutual, a fair division between the two, to be worth anything.

Now to jump to a type of work at the top or the upper end, the work of the higher-class mechanic, that of a first-class machinist, a finely educated machinist. What I want to show you gentlemen is that it is an almost universal fact, so nearly so that the exceptions are very few, that the science of doing any class of work is so great, that the man that is fit to work at his trade cannot possibly understand the science of that trade. As you go up in the scale and the work becomes more important and intricate, that fact becomes all the more true: he cannot possibly understand that work; it needs another man to teach him. That explains in a broad, general way why you have to have so many teachers, so many men on the management side.

Take the case of a repeat shop, a machine shop where the work is mostly of the repeat kind. Especially I have in mind one shop where my friend Karl Barth systematized the work. It is a noted shop; its product is sold right here in your town, a great deal of it; it is one of the most noted in the United States. The head of it built up his own works from twenty-five men to something like four hundred men. He sent for my friend to introduce this system into one department, mak-

ing a certain article. These things are standard, thousands of them are made every year, and between three and five hundred men were engaged in that department. So the work was very greatly subdivided: one man would make only four or five different kinds of parts in the year. My friend, the owner of the establishment—I knew him, had worked for him,—was stubborn, but a fine character. You have to look out: if you would teach your system, you have to have an understanding, to have a little discrimination. At the start if you come out and say what you expect to do in the way of increasing output it may startle a man. My friend called Mr. Barth into his office and said he wanted him to see if he could do anything in that department. He said right away he thought he could increase its output to twice as much. You can imagine the row there was! That lasted a few minutes. However, the owner went out with him to the department in question, and showing it to him asked him if he thought he could do anything to make it more productive. He replied, certainly he could increase it two and a half times, may be three times! The establishment had been going on several years. It had patented machines, high class tradesmen and engineers. Of course there was another explosion. But it didn't go very far. Mr. Barth asked the owner, "Wouldn't you like me to show you what I can do with any one of your men?" "Certainly," he said. So he picked out a very fair machine, a representative machine, with a man who had been running that machine there for twelve years, a high-class mechanic, who had done very good, skilful work, with the help of his foreman. It was a fair test. I want to show you the methods, what is done in a case of that sort.

Here I have four different implements to study machines. This one takes care of all gear problems, the velocity of lathes, weak links, the range of teeth, and the safe limit. These instruments were not used before; they have been developed from scientific management. This one has to do with belt problems; anyone who has figured on belt problems knows that it is quite a little trick, not something you can tell off the bat; this instrument will solve in a few seconds a problem that would take a good many minutes, sometimes an hour, to do in the old way! This one tells just how fast you can run a tool, how many feet of chips you can remove in a minute with all kinds of tools. This tells how many pounds pressure will be exerted on the nose of your tool without cutting the metal. With these instruments you have analyzed the effect of your work and the capacity of your machine, and

you are then in a position to see just how fast that machine should be run to do its work right. Not one in fifty of the machines are speeded right. They are away off, in many cases two, three or four hundred per cent. off. I gave that challenge once to a number of machinists, and not one of them took it up. This is so because they have been speeded all by guess, not with regard to the science of cutting metals. Mr. Barth found the machine selected for his test something like 300 per cent. wrong. That workman couldn't do his work right; he didn't know that, but it was not his fault that he didn't.

Now after writing the prescription for the proper speeding of that machine Mr. Barth went home and came back in about a week, by which time he had made a slide rule of this sort. Under scientific management an instrument of this sort has to be made for every machine, in order to tell your man how to do his work. This looks like frightful red tape and extravagance. But every shop that has come under scientific management has paid better than before, a great sight better. This is not theory, it is fact. Mr. Barth had never seen the work done; but he made a gain of two and a half to nine times in the work done. It took about three and a half to four years to make over that shop entirely. Is it possible with an implement like this for any man to make that immense gain, as against the years of experience of a high-class mechanic who had the help of his foreman and his superintendent? Because it sounds like a fairy tale. It is possible, for this reason: the science of cutting metals is a great science; that of shoveling is a small science.

In 1881, I had had three years' fight with the machinists of the Midvale Steel Works, (I went there as a laborer after having served my two apprenticeships, and finally came to be foreman of the shop). I had a most wretched fight for three years, in forcing the men of that shop to do halfway decent work. It was not a new game; they knew I knew they were restricting output to about one-third of a day's work; they thought they would be treated just the same as others and have their wages cut down. They came to me and said: "See here, you have got to be foreman; we think all right of you, but you are not going to be a piece-work hog, are you?" I told them I was going to get the output out of those machines. "We will have you over the fence inside of six weeks, then," said they. So that fight started, they did their best to get me over the fence, and I did my best to keep inside it, but after three years of perfectly wretched, abominable fighting, we had

increased the output to nearly double what it had been. It was not yet where it ought to be, but it was well along. I realized that those men were my superiors; they knew vastly more than I did about the work of that shop. So I went to Mr. William Sellers, one of the most noted steel workers, and asked him to experiment, to get the knowledge of the workmen on our side. I kept on insisting on reasonable work, and as a reward for having driven those fellows into this work he let me make a long series of experiments, on many lines. Every mechanic had an idea that if he could find the proper cutting angle for tools he could do a great deal faster work. You all know the three cutting angles: the clearance angle, the side slope, and the back slope. We had perhaps the only shop in Philadelphia fit for such an experiment, as we had a lot of scrap tires, locomotive tires, which we could use for it. By mere accident we had this material, and it takes a lot of material to reduce anything to a law in cutting metals. In six months, so far as cutting speed was concerned, we gained only about five per cent. That was only one element of the whole twelve great elements that go to make up the art of cutting metals. Every one thought it would be a greater gain, so in that respect the experiment was fruitless; but it unearthed a gold mine. All I had to do was to show Mr. Sellers the possibilities ahead, and he allowed us to go ahead with those experiments. The simplest of elements in cutting metals is to keep your tool cool. We found that if you throw a heavy stream of water right on the nose of the tool and the chip, the cooling effect was so great that you could increase the cutting speed by 40 per cent. There are two causes that prevent good work; the friction drawing the temper of the finished tool, and the heat making the chip clog the edge. It was necessary to see Mr. Sellers. The whole world had used a trickling stream for ages in cutting metals, but no one had used a heavy stream. So he gave us permission, and we tore down the machine shop, set every machine in a concrete water bath, and built a whole machine shop to go after that 40 per cent. And what happened? Only one company in twenty years followed us in that! Our competitors said, "Oh pshaw, you can't have a sloop like that around!" and they did not gain that 40 per cent.!

To justify scientific management, in the Midvale Steel Works, which was bought for \$75,000 in 1873, and not a new dollar has gone into it, it is now worth \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000. And scientific management is doing just such things as that, thousands of them, just as staggering as that, they pile up like snowballs!

Those experiments went on continuously all the time I was there, from 1881 to 1890, without intermission; as long as we were able to show results we had men cutting chips, and others watching them, writing down results. The method of financing had to change. We had to take out enough work to offer any man or shop that would build us machines; we would furnish the people, the labor, the tools and the materials. This work went on through a period of twenty-six years, and during all that time, I want to emphasize this, it was carried on not because someone was interested in the science or art of cutting metals, but because it was making money for the people investigating this thing.

I want to give you a glimpse, a look, mark my words, at what is going to take place in every industry in this country: not only the study of physical facts, but the study of men is now going on at an immense rate. I suppose there are five thousand men making this microscopic study of men.

Throughout a great part of the time, whenever we found a fact, whenever we wanted to use that fact, we had to develop a method, a formula, to express that law. So we had to employ professors, mathematicians, who were employed for this one problem. They were paid because they earned money for the company. Whenever we ran against a great applied mathematician we went to him with our results and we placed the problem before him; we offered him his own money, if he would offer to solve the problem. "What!" he would exclaim, "solve a problem with twelve unknown quantities! one might solve a problem with four, or five, or even six unknowns, but with twelve you will have to solve it by the method of 'trial and error.'" Now no doubt you have come to the conclusion, "This is about the most conceited thing there is; he just wants to brag how great he and his friends are!" I want to try to convince you—the ordinary man, the average—that you can solve very difficult problems, anything that comes in your way, if you will only pay the price in time and hard work; it doesn't require any more brains or ability than the ordinary man possesses. Only one man has betrayed more ability, and has come near the thing, the problem was almost solved when he came to the company, but I don't want to belittle his work. After eighteen years of work, and after the ridicule of the men in our profession,—engineer after engineer heard of our work and came and appraised our work, then would come into the office and sit there and roar with laughter at the ridiculousness of the thing, and so it was ridiculous perhaps at that time, because the thing had not gone

far enough,—well, a problem that it takes a good man through “trial and error” from four to eight hours to solve in the old way, with this implement you can have it solved by an ordinary machinist in twenty seconds! (Laughter.) That brings the thing right down to a practical basis.

Just one thing more before I close. I have no doubt you men are saying, many of you, “What is going to become of our high-class workmen, if all this work is taken out of their hands and turned over to the men on the management side? Will it not dwarf our workmen, our thinking men?” I say without hesitation, that if the answer is that it is going to dwarf our workmen, if it is going to be bad for them but good for the companies, this whole scheme will fall to the ground, because anything that is not going to develop them and make them a higher class of workmen is not going to survive, and ought not to survive! No doubt the thought is going through your heads, “You are taking away his judgment; when he had the problems to solve he had to use his judgment.” That is the rankest kind of guessing; you might about as well toss a penny. I believe I am as good a guesser as any man in the United States, when it comes to machine work: give me the materials and the tools and leave me to guess the result, and my guess will be as good as that of any other mechanic; I have had my judgment trained in the old-fashioned way; but my guess won’t come within 300 per cent. I have spent forty or fifty years doing this, and I know how big a liar my guess would be. But let me try to convince you, that this is not going to dwarf our workmen, by calling to your attention the greatest mechanic in the world: how does he teach his apprentices? The greatest mechanic in the world is the modern surgeon: he combines the most manual dexterity with intellectual knowledge, good nerve, and knowledge of implements, I believe, in the world. “Now do you see,” he says to his apprentices! “What we want is your initiative, your ingenuity; of course we older surgeons have our prejudices, and we have developed instruments, but don’t let that interfere with your originality and your perfect development; we older surgeons use a saw to take off a bone, but if you prefer a hatchet or an ax, chop away!” (Laughter.) Is that what he says? Not on your life! He says, “You boys, don’t perform the simplest operation there ever was till you have learned not only what implements to use,—you have to use the implements handed down through three or four generations of surgeons just as they are; you have to learn how to handle them; not a stroke till you learn how to handle them! We want your ingenuity,

but start where we leave off! Learn the best there is, and when you have learned our way, if you see some defect in it, and think there is a better way, then invent, but upward, not downward; start where we leave off, and work upward!"

Scientific management says to the man in a trade: "We don't know it all: the implements we have and the methods we use will be superseded; but we do know a good deal; we have been many years selecting these methods; we want you to start here, practise our methods; we won't hear a word from you till you have done things in our method; then if you have a suggestion, come and give it to us." Most of our suggestions come to us from our workmen; and when one is given, we conduct a carefully tried series of experiments to see whether it is quicker and better; if it is, then we adopt it, not only for that man, but for every man in the establishment. (Applause.)

(January 27th, 1913.)

What Health Work Means

BY DR. W. A. EVANS.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club held on the 27th January, Dr. W. A. Evans said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—It has been suggested that by reason of my four years' association with the Department of Health of the city of Chicago you would be interested in having me bring to you the results of those experiences. And yet not altogether are my opinions based upon those experiences. In the prosecution of the work of that office I found that it was advisable to have my people profit by the experiences of other people. In consequence I went to those meetings where public health officials were gathered together, and listened to the discussion of the problems of the city and of the State by health officers from many parts of the country. I have gathered information where it was possible for me to find it, and nowhere have I found richer mines of information than in the hands and in the possession of the health officers of the different parts of Canada. I have learned much from your imperial, or rather from your national or Dominion Department of Health. I have learned much from the Provincial Departments of Health. And I have learned a great deal from the experiences of the Department of Health of the city of Toronto. And such views as I have and shall express are a composite of the experiences that came to me in administering the Department of Health of the city of Chicago, and the experiences that have come to others in administering their different Departments of Health.

And perhaps also you are interested in what I have to say by reason of the fact that I am now, more than in former times, engaged in an effort to translate the information and the points of view of those who are working technically, that is, who are in technical touch with the problems of the day, into the language of the street, to the end that the average man or woman can come to understand that the responsibility for health betterment cannot be left in the hands of any group or individuals, that it cannot be wholly delegated, but that a

* Dr. W. A. Evans was formerly Director of Public Health for Chicago. He is an enthusiast in his chosen field of work and an impressive speaker.

large part of that responsibility rests, and must always rest, in the common intelligence and in the common conscience of the average run of the people, of the people at large. And therefore, if it were possible for men to move from things worse to things better, it would become possible by reason of the growth and diffusion of information amongst the people.

And these are perhaps the reasons why I have been asked to come here to-day, and talk, not to your health officers either municipal or Provincial, but to talk to you, the people of Toronto, the people that constitute the backing of those health officers, the people that must understand things if Toronto is to move onward.

And now, what is meant by the question? What does a Health Department, or Health Work, mean? What idea, what question, are you asking in your mind? I must speak to you for a while in explanation of some things done by Health Departments; and probably a majority of you are not cognizant of what is being done even by your Health Department here in Toronto. I must speak also in some measure of what Health Departments can do that they are not doing; of what they should do in the immediate future; and what the existence of the State demands that they should eventually do.

One of the principal things being done is keeping books of the community. The division in which this comes is known as the Division of Vital Statistics. There are relatively few entries in this book, in which are made entries of the welfare of the public from a health or physical point of view. One of the most important is that in regard to deaths; that is done with practically 100 per cent. perfection: practically all deaths are recorded. But when we pass beyond that bit of information conveyed by the certificate of death we find ourselves in a realm where there is much indeed of importance. The death certificate not only states the fact that a given individual residing at a given point has died, but also gives some information of sociological importance relative to that individual, and also some information of the disease which is important as distinguished from its sociological importance.

There is need for more information and for greater accuracy of information on much of these lines. It would be better if all the certified information there stated was more accurately stated. And it would be much better if the information as to the cause of death was more accurately stated. This is by reason of the fact that studies are made of these death certificates, and from these studies conclusions are drawn as to what a community should do or not do along many different

lines. It is as a result of such conclusions that a community determines many of its activities. It is as a result of such conclusions that Health Departments predicate their line of fight, lay out their plans of battle, outline their campaigns. Therefore, if the information is inaccurately given, if the facts are improperly set forth, the conclusions drawn therefrom are liable to be misleading.

We probably do not comprehend, and for many years shall not be able to comprehend, the interest the community has in its type of medical practitioners. But the time will come when the community will understand that it cannot afford to have any but the highest type of medical practitioner; that the real interest in better laws relating to the practice of medicine and to the training of the medical men, is not the interest of his fellow practitioners, but is the interest of the community at large.

And these constitute practically the only entries that are to be found in this book of record. There are a few entries relating to disease that has not terminated in death, but they are not very comprehensive in character, by reason of the fact that a man who has scarlet fever conclusively and definitely does not have scarlet fever alone. We have this as an example that no man lives his life alone; no man has scarlet fever alone, for where this man suffers from scarlet fever the influence is felt by a considerable part of his community. There is reason for readjusting family relations and neighborhood relations, and if the reason becomes extensive enough, also for readjusting the relations of the community.

And so we have entries for scarlet fever; similarly there are entries for diphtheria, and other diseases, in which the interest of the community in the individual is so palpably plain and provable that it is practically universally accepted. There is a tendency at times to broaden out this list. There is a suggestion rightly made that speedily there be entered in this list—venereal diseases. I believe there is reason to believe that the contagious nature of venereal diseases should be accepted. The British army did not make headway in control of that type of contagion in its ranks until Lord Kitchener realized it was an actuality, a thing in actual existence, a source of great disability to that army, a disabling force that must be reckoned with, and the way to reckon with it was to recognize the fact that the disease was an actuality, and proceed along much the same lines as we were proceeding in controlling other preventable diseases. The inauguration of a more intelligent policy, a more highly educational policy, in the control of venereal

diseases came at the insistence of Lord Kitchener. Its influence was not limited, however, to the British army, for the discoveries made in his work, the administrative methods studied, outlined and accepted as a result of the effort of Lord Kitchener, spread out, and are made use of in the army of the United States, and are being seriously considered for the purpose of finding methods of application to the problem of venereal diseases in civilian life.

Another line of activity at present engaged in by Departments of Health is control of contagions, the working out of the principles of the science of epidemiology, a science that is at the present time a science, and on which men have a right to enthuse by reason of the fact that the facts are in hand, and the scientific results of these facts are so determinable and so provable that there is reason for the scientific opinions of men on this question. And, *per contra*, the day is past when men can stand amongst intelligent men and contend for opinions that have no scientific basis for them. By that I mean this: the time has been when men who did not believe in the communicability of scarlet fever and the germ theory and the necessity for vaccination could say, "I don't know; I have no scientific basis for my opinion, and neither has the other fellow." But time has served to separate these groups, until at the present time there is a division between those who know and those who pretend to know, or rather those who hold two opinions and don't pretend that there are facts and a scientific basis for those opinions.

The development of the control of contagions under the department of health has proceeded more rapidly and has worked out more thoroughly than has the development of others of its activities. There are certain reasons for that: one of them is this, that the principle of contagion is always present; in a community such as this, scarlet fever and diphtheria contagion is endemic, it is with us all the time. The health officer can take off time for excursions into epidemiology and sociology but scarlet fever is open for his study any time. There is another reason: I have just read Cutting's "Relations of the Church and Disease," in which he expresses the opinion that business men are more responsible for the development of a better dealing with health conditions than the Church. When New York was paralyzed by cholera, business could not prosper; it was being fought by cholera, and so business fought back; in consequence there was an interest on the part of business men in the work of the Health Department. When New Orleans was paralyzed by yellow fever, men

could not do business, in consequence there could be no prosperity; so the Health Department in New Orleans was backed up by the business men. But there came a time when the Health Departments had developed such efficiency on that line that, practically unaided, they could deal alone with those epidemics and bring about a condition in which the dealing with a paralyzing epidemic was no longer such that people could not trade, and in consequence they lost the active support of the business men, who unfortunately assumed an antagonistic attitude to this Department.

I would I could make you business men here to-day understand that the inefficiency of disease is now in the group of preventable diseases, that the waste of disease, against which you are not now concerning yourselves,—that this kind of waste through inefficiency is harming business more than scarlet fever or yellow fever or cholera did, in the days when those diseases were more in evidence than they are at the present time! I would I could convince you business men of your interest in the proper housing of your working men, that your interest is in playgrounds, that your interest is in proper working conditions for the men who work in your shops! In the light of your own interest, your interest in the welfare of your men should be greater than the interest of the business men in public health was in the olden day.

Health Departments at the present time are going somewhat beyond this. They are concerning themselves somewhat with the preservation of the water supply to the end that the community may be spared the ravages of typhoid fever, but more than the water supply has to be considered, for Hazen's law is that for every death from typhoid fever by reason of poor water supply there are three deaths from other conditions. You know now, gentlemen, I am now speaking only in terms of death; and I want you to keep clear in your minds the distinction between inefficiency and death. Death represents the maximum, the consummation, but that which you have to bear in far greater measure is the inefficiency, the waste of effort, that comes about by reason of the fact that men are working below par. For when men cease to work the loss falls not on the community but on their immediate families; but when men work at low efficiency the cost is borne by you who employ those men.

Some work is being done by Departments of Health in conserving food supplies to the end that in great measure the label may state the facts that there may be no improper methods in production, and in some measure that there may be more

healthful foods than under old conditions. There is one place where the activity is great in this direction, greater than anywhere else,—in the conservation of that great article of food that is eaten raw, the milk supply. I trust that the Canadian Club will back up the Health Department to the full in its efforts to conserve the milk supply of the city of Toronto.

And something is being done in the way of educating the people, and I believe nothing being done at the present time is of more consequence than this. But it is little good for those who know to know, if that information can find no method of reaching those who need to know! Two hundred years ago, William Hunter discovered from an operation that an accident to a mother could not mark the body of her unborn child. That information, final and conclusive, has been known in university halls for two hundred years; and yet hundreds of thousands of women have gone through pregnancy with their minds disturbed lest their children should come into the world marked. What good did it do Hunter to know that centuries ago, when there was no provision for carrying that information from the university halls down to the streets and alleys of the town, to the minds of the mothers that yearned for peace and could not find it? Hundreds of years ago Mendel discovered the laws of inheritance. He died in a monastery, his libraries were buried on shelves and covered by dust, and for fifty years they found no avenue of escape from those library shelves until, approximately half a century after, a descendant of Darwin opened up the window with the object that this information might escape; and within the last few years we are beginning to understand the principles of inheritance, principles through which we hope the race, the race here in Canada, may escape some of its inherited ills, so that those who are to be born in the years to come may be brawnier and better than those before them. But till this knowledge was diffused nothing was accomplished: what good did it do that Mendel half a century before had discovered this law, when there was no machinery for bringing it to the level of the people until more than a century ago Erasmus Darwin worked out the principles by which inheritance worked out on individuals? His trials have been accepted by scientists since, but they were not accepted at once: it was nearly a century after Erasmus Darwin died before men began to understand that these principles were founded upon the principle of environment. That information must be brought to the man in the street,—that bad housing makes bad citizens, that poor housing fills the poorhouses and the jails; that the way to better-

ment is by improving environment. A most important work of the Health Department should be to broaden, develop, expand, elaborate, and make 100 per cent. perfect the work of providing the means whereby the information gathered in the universities by research may trickle down and enter into the common lives and the common point of view of the men who make up the common citizenship of the community.

There are other lines along which I believe the Health Department work should be developed. I believe there is great need that the Health Departments should concern themselves with city planning. There are questions of health involved in it. We are going to take men from the country, where there was sunshine in plenty, where the air was all around, exercising its purifying influence, and bring them into the city, for social reasons, by reason of the fact that men work better together than they do in isolation and individually. It is by reason of this that a community lives, that it is made prosperous, that manufactures are developed, that your flowers and pictures are appreciated, that music finds a place. By reason of these opportunities do cities grow. It is in response to these great underlying principles of community life. But we cannot have these things without paying the price. We must gather men from the fields of Hungary, from the shores of the Adriatic, from the wilds of the West; and we cannot gather them and put them into a community without incurring an obligation of honor to provide that the children born to them shall be born in places where the sun can come; that when they go out from their homes they shall have parks and playgrounds in which to play. We incur an obligation of honor that is of infinitely greater consequence: that is this: to see to it that the homes in which these children live are homes into which sunlight can come; that they are not crowded, thousands to the acre, in habitations where flowers cannot flourish. The Health Department should consider as its problems the problems of congestion and occupation of the land, overcrowding, living underground, in cellars and sub-cellars.

It should concern itself with the development of hospitals; and remember that there too you are attempting to cure, and that is un wisdom: the wise thing is to look to it that there shall be such city planning, as has been worked out in various cities of the world, that there shall be no need of hospitals. City plans such as those of Essen and Frankfurt, and various other German cities, also of London and various parts of England, are available. I can remember that my city had the lowest death rate of all the large cities of the world; and

I pride myself on this, that I am of that race that has gone to England, and taken Old London with all the errors of centuries on its shoulders, and has worked out such plans of living there that London within the last five years has had the lowest death rate of any great city of the world. And if it is possible for London, how infinitely easy it would be for Toronto!

I believe that Health Departments have as a part of their legitimate work such studies of economics as those of Dr. Bryce, of the Interior Department of the Dominion of Canada, a study of immigration, the type of men that come, the relations of the immigrants to the resident population, the distribution of those immigrants all over the country, the number that go to the soil to produce, and the number that go to the city to be fed. And out of that another question arises: you come to the study of the great problem of the increased cost of living. This problem will come up when around the Council Board there are seated the men of the Health Department, for health is written in the price of wheat! Health, the possibilities for or against, is written in the price of land, in the height of buildings, in the width of your streets! There is none of these problems that does not have its health relation. (Applause.)

And now, very briefly, what does health mean? What does it mean in the way of the prospect that it opens up? I believe that this statement can be proven, that health is purchasable, and that any community can have just as much of health as it is willing to pay for! I have on more than one occasion analyzed this statement further, and have stated just what in my judgment can be accomplished by a Health Department that costs the community 10 cents per capita, just what can be accomplished by a Health Department that costs its community 25 cents per capita, and just what can be accomplished by a Health Department that costs its community \$1 per capita. I have no time to develop that thought here to-day; but I want again to reiterate my acceptance of that belief, that a community can have just as much health as it is willing to pay for, and that the measure of disease in a community is the measure of the willingness or unwillingness of that community to have its conditions rectified;—not a paper willingness, understand, but a pocketbook willingness!

Dr. Metchnikoff has divided diseases into those which are accidental and those which are not accidental. Consumption, typhoid, and all diseases of infection, he says, are accidents, including scarlet fever and venereal diseases; they have

no place in the great, broad, biological scheme of life; and therefore when a community has worked out its destiny along the broadest biological and sociological lines, that community will see an entire cessation of all types of infectious diseases. And I believe Irving Fisher, who has studied this subject more extensively than perhaps anyone else, says that we should see an increase in the average span of human life of fourteen years, and he adds: "In this I am taking no account of the cumulative benefits of the fact that you cut off 10 per cent. of the rate by typhoid fever, and you cut off a certain percentage for every disease that results from lowered health consciousness. Whenever you go against smallpox, you not only go against smallpox directly, but you elevate the standard of any other conditions that represent and answer to the question of health." May I make perhaps an improvement on this by saying, that out of those improved conditions will flow certain other cumulative benefits, such that the gain will be more than fourteen years.

I have not time to develop this subject. But by reason of research I expect cancer would cease. I believe many men who are in this hall at the present time will live to see consumption's ravages checked. As a result of these efforts there will be conservation of child life; children will be better born, coming into an environment that is better, and going through school life under better conditions, and all down the line the unfavorable conditions will be lessened. But any gain in life expectancy to men past fifty years of age will be achieved only when the work of the Health Department is made an actual success by men such as you. Then, I believe, there shall be control of rheumatism, of Bright's disease, of heart disease, perhaps of obesity.

Certainly I believe that the point of view of the future is going to be determined by men who demand efficiency. I don't believe that for long our profession of sanitarians will be open to the charge that we cipher in terms of death and deficiency. I believe that the time will come before long when things will be different; when we shall be keeping books in terms of efficiency, rather than inefficiency. One reason will be, that the men who have deserted the Health Department, are no longer interested in the work of the Health Department, and do not back up the work of the Health Department, will come back to its support, by reason of the fact that it will be possible to demonstrate to them in figures that a community in poor health labors at poor efficiency. A factory whose operatives are not properly housed when at work or when at home, will

find that they are a source of diminished revenue for that factory. As a result of looking at the matter from that point of view, the owners will come back to the support of the Health Department.

Now, gentlemen, I am concluding this address to you men who constitute the membership of the Canadian Club of the city of Toronto. I believe that the very best possible idea that you can get into your mind is that of the great obligation you men of the Canadian Club owe to your country, what you should be for Canada; and I am sure this interest will spread in the problems of the house, the fireside, the street, and the problems of the people that make up the Dominion of Canada." (Applause.)

(February 3rd, 1913.)

The Needs of the University of Toronto

BY SIR EDMUND WALKER, C.V.O., LL.D.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 3rd February, 1913, Sir Edmund Walker said:

Mr. President, President Falconer, Gentlemen,—We have, as you will see from my remarks, laid before the Government a report upon the development of the University of Toronto which gives every kind of information, statistical and otherwise, that one could seek. I have the permission of the Government for the distribution of this report, and the people and the press can therefore now obtain it.

My address to-day will be more historical in character, and along but a few lines, such as seem suitable for an occasion of this kind.

On the night of the 14th of February, 1890, I had just finished dining, and was preparing to go with members of my family to the conversazione at the University, where some new scientific experiments were to be shown, with the usual rather forlorn hope of interesting the average citizen in the higher aspects of life. Suddenly, from a window I saw a great light in the sky, and in a few minutes everybody seemed to know that the University was on fire. I say *the* University, because what we now call the main building was practically all that represented the University in stone or brick in those days. The Biological Building had been commenced but was not finished. After a night of tragic excitement we knew that the building was mainly gutted, the Library and much else totally destroyed, that which represented the highest life in the Province of Ontario was in ruins. I was not connected with the University, and represented the kind of citizen who revered such seats of learning with a warm but rather vague regard, because never having had the privilege of attending the University, I knew about its work only in a very general way. But at this sad moment, thousands of citizens like my-

* As one who has unselfishly given a great deal of his time, both to the reconstruction of the University a few years ago and to its management as Chairman of its Board of Governors, Sir Edmund Walker is well qualified to speak of its financial position.

self realized for the first time that the University was the most important institution in Canada apart from the Government itself. Every high hope we held for the future of this country depended mainly upon our system of education, and that which set the standard in education for all Canada was in ruins. It was then that some of us learned that we possessed a State University which the State did not aid, and had never aided except by the original land grant given by the early legislation of Governor Simcoe; and unless both the State and the people as individuals came forward our future was indeed in peril.

The fire was, however, a blessing in disguise. The Government made the first gift in its history, \$160,000, all of which went towards the restoration of the building. The Province of Quebec, gentlemen, I ask you to remember, at that moment in our history at once gave \$10,000 (applause), and \$50,000 came from private sources. This \$60,000 was used in erecting a Library. Books were donated to the extent of about 30,000 volumes, which in some measure replaced the 33,000 volumes that had been burned. What a contrast to these days, when \$800,000 can be raised in a fortnight's campaign of collecting for one of our institutions! Small as the gifts were, they made the ordinary struggle of the University just a trifle less hard. At the time of the fire the number of students in attendance in Arts was 504, and the total yearly income was considerably less than \$100,000, somewhere about eighty or ninety thousand dollars a year, I think. There were also some students in medicine, but that department paid its own way.

I was allowed to help Sir Daniel Wilson in the work of collecting money, and later he asked me to join the Board of Trustees. I was then asked to prepare a report on the financial condition of the University, the poverty of which was standing in the way of all progress. After this my connection with the finances of the University became more or less recognized, and the long and uphill fight for an income began. The view of the Government, as expressed to us by Sir Oliver Mowat and his successors for many years, was that whatever might be the claims of the University for support the Province could not afford to admit them. I recall our pitiable condition when the Chemical Laboratory and the Gymnasium and Students' Union were built. Professor Pike used to say that we need not pretend that we taught chemistry: we only had the subject in the curriculum! The pressure for these buildings could no longer be withstood, but it was still urged that we

had no money. In the end, except some small subscriptions to the Gymnasium and Students' Union, we built them out of the endowment, and raised the fees to recover the income thus lost.

By and by Mr. Hardy, who had succeeded Sir Oliver as Premier, while adhering to Sir Oliver's views as to University support, acknowledged some claims of the University against the old Government of Canada, and we got a few townships of wild land in Northern Ontario, and \$7,000 a year in money. Thus we hirkled along, every effort at expansion practically obstructed.

Sir George Ross succeeded Mr. Hardy, and as Canada was now growing very rapidly, and the attendance at the University increasing correspondingly, its financial condition soon reached a desperate stage. An appeal was made repeatedly for assistance from the Government, and finally after several years of the most uncomfortably strenuous persistence on our part we obtained some sources of income sufficient to amount to \$96,000 in the last year of Sir George Ross' administration.

In the United States, universities belonging to the State are supported generally out of a direct tax collected for the Government by the municipalities, and sometimes levied as a special tax for University purposes. As the money produced by such a tax grows proportionately with the increasing total of the assessed value of the property in the State, it presumably meets the increasing needs of a University which come from larger attendance and improvement in methods. As we unfortunately have not yet begun direct taxation—direct taxation seems to be a sort of red rag to a bull when proposed to a Government! (Laughter)—we turned to some existing kind of revenue which would naturally grow in amount and which might grow as fast as our needs. We thought of the Succession Dues accruing from the estates of deceased citizens, and we pressed Mr. Ross for years to give us a share of these Succession Dues for University purposes. This was refused, doubtless because there were many other claims upon the Government which to them seemed as pressing as ours, and unfortunately the Government possessed no system of finance by which things needed for our progress could be accomplished and be paid for by direct taxation. Both Sir George Ross' Government and Sir James Whitney's received from various quarters different kinds of revenue: for example, from liquor licenses, and they are trying to lessen the number of licenses all the time; so that must decline; they get a revenue from

timber dues and mining dues; these also are uncertain sources; and there are the dues from the estates of people who die, but they don't seem to die with any kind of regularity! (Laughter.) What I would call a true system of taxation is one that would in addition to all our present sources of revenue, provide the balance necessary to enable the Government to do the many things desired by the people but which are not done because the Government has not sufficient money in its hands. We haven't that in Ontario, and it is the greatest lack in our financial affairs. All of us are foolish that we do not go to Sir James Whitney and insist that we be taxed directly and that things we desire to have done be thus accomplished. Of course it requires a large kind of sense to do such a thing, but there are communities that have done so! (Laughter.) Sir George Ross, however, helped the University to an important extent. We shall ever be thankful for what he did, though he didn't do enough. (Laughter.) The splendid Physics Buildings and the Convocation Hall were commenced and partly paid for by his Government, and by private subscriptions, and with help from Sir James Whitney's Government, we got them finished.

At this moment, however, new buildings were necessary in every direction, and our income was so straitened that growth was extremely difficult. Every sign of expansion, every evidence of the increasing usefulness of the University, every measure of appreciation, coupled as it always was with hopes for a larger future, became a sorrow, a trouble, a weariness to the Trustees, instead of a joy as it should have been.

When Sir James Whitney became Premier we laid our troubles before him; we went to him at once,—I think it must have been the first or second Saturday he was in office; he said he would give us the whole of a Saturday afternoon. He told us he intended to appoint a University Commission to find out things he did not understand about the University, to acquire indeed the necessary information to guide his Government in shaping the future of the University. The Trustees welcomed this, but begged for immediate help to begin the construction of certain buildings and to pay part of the cost of those already commenced. This aid was given by the issue of annuities by the Government equal to a cash value of \$580,000, such annuities to be paid as they matured by the Government direct.

Then followed the report of the Commission, accompanied by a draft Bill in the interest of the University, which was passed without material alterations. Under it we received the

first income from the Government of which the Trustees were allowed to shape the course of the relative expenditure. We were to receive a sum equal to one-half the amount of the Succession Dues paid to the Province averaged over three preceding years. This began in the University year of 1906-7—our year does not run with the calendar year—producing a revenue of a little over \$200,000, which rapidly increased until 1909-10, when it reached \$500,000. Then, to our dismay,—and that is really why we are in trouble to-day,—it fell away to about \$450,000, and for 1912-13 is estimated at only \$423,000. For three short years we had a rather joyous time, in which we could do at least some of those things that we wanted to do; we were able to meet in detail many of the demands upon the University for buildings, laboratory equipment and general expansion, and we were able also to make an adjustment of the salaries of the staff in order to try partly to meet the increase in the cost of living—there had not been such an adjustment for many years.

The Government required us out of the Succession Dues to pay for our buildings by annual payments to cover interest and a sinking fund. In the United States I know of no University which is required to build its buildings out of its income: income, from whatever source, being used for the maintenance of the University, but if a building is required it is regarded as a State building, just as a State Library would be. Our trouble at the present moment is really due to the fact that we endeavored to pay the cost of our buildings out of this income, thinking that we could both administer the University and build the buildings; in that respect we made a great mistake. The annual payments for buildings have already cost us \$183,000.

But I would not have you think that because we received this large increase in our income we spent it all. That, unfortunately, is the kind of idea prevailing in the minds of some people. Far from this, we piled up out of those fat years the reserves which have made it possible for us to survive ever since. I do not wish to weary you with statistics, but I should like to read one of the various tables in a Report on the Development of the University, 1906-07 to 1912-13, which is now in the hands of the Government. I hope every one of you will send to the Bursar for a copy of that report: because to my mind the University is the second institution in this Province—second only to the Government itself.

The following table gives the Revenue and Expenditure from 1906-07:

	Provincial Grant under Act of 1906.	Percentage of Total Income.	Fees.	Percentage of Total Income.	Provincial Grant for Faculty of Education.	Income from Dining Hall & Residences	Total Revenue.
1906-07	\$213,258	=47%	\$184,211	=40%			\$456,398
1907-08	357,444	=56%	213,219	=33%	\$15,000		642,108
1908-09	422,232	=57%	224,405	=30%	15,000	\$26,578	741,155
1909-10	500,000	=59%	237,938	=28%	15,000	35,712	840,307
1910-11	459,503	=55%	263,907	=31%	15,000	41,173	836,039
1911-12	448,325	=52%	264,895	=31%	15,000	55,717	854,594
*1912-13	423,000	=51%	270,000	=33%	15,000	57,000	824,359
*Estimated							

	Capital Account Charges.	Residences and Dining Hall.	Total Expenditure.	Surpluses.	Deficits.
1906-07			\$411,696	\$44,701	
1907-08			613,344	28,763	
1908-09		\$34,223	679,867	61,287	
1909-10	\$25,260	33,755	752,183	88,124	
1910-11	36,122	35,303	777,810	58,229	
1911-12	54,132	47,141	875,849		\$21,255
*1912-13	68,000	49,130	931,428		107,069
*Estimated					

This statement should to a business man explain our difficulties better than many words of mine.

Presuming for the moment that we can justify the increase in expenditure from \$411,000 in 1906-07 to \$931,000 in 1912-13, it is plain that we have reached a crisis and that the splendid generosity of the Government in giving us the new income referred to has nevertheless fallen short of meeting our needs, so that some new plan must be devised.

I am not attempting at this time to make a complete statement of the case for the University. That will be found in the report to which I have referred. What I must do to-day, however, is to indicate broadly the reasons for the great increase in the cost of administration. Removing the charges on capital account, the expenditures have a trifle more than doubled in seven years. But it will be observed that they increased fifty per cent. in the first year, this being largely due to the adjustment of the salaries and to the exercise in some degree of the long-restrained power to do justice to the many species of expenditure necessary for the good of the University. For the remaining six years the increase has been gradual and at a pace such as we may expect unless the Univer-

sity is to be crippled. Outside of the increase in capital charges, the remaining increase of sixty or seventy thousand dollars a year is one that can by no kind of administration be prevented, unless by starving the University in a dangerous way. If business men will judge us by results,—by any measure they would apply to their own business,—we can cheerfully abide the answer to any enquiry. Our attendance grew from 3,038 in 1906-7 to over 4,000 in 1909-10. Then the standard was raised. In 1909 the requirement of matriculation rose from 33 per cent. to 40 per cent. on each paper; in 1911 to 40 per cent. with an average of 50 per cent. on all the papers, and in 1912 to 40 per cent. with an average of 60 per cent. Other changes have also been made, none of which certainly tends to increase the attendance. I think there are those who imagine that the President and the Governors would like to see the students reach an indefinite number. We have no such desire: we have rather the feeling that increase beyond a certain point may diminish efficiency. The effect of raising the standard was that it kept the attendance just about stationary; otherwise there might be now five thousand students.

But perhaps we spend too much on these students. Here is a comparison drawn from the report referred to. In the United States the cost per student ranges from \$190 to \$264 per annum, and in only one university is it below \$200. Our cost on the same basis is \$186. In Great Britain the cost on a basis which can only be compared with the matriculated students in attendance on classes in the University of Toronto, ranges from \$300 to \$588 per student, while ours on this basis is only \$227. No business man could conclude from this that we are extravagant.

If we have administered the income carefully, and if we have taken advantage of the rush of students to uplift the standards, and if the students continue to come in increasing numbers, what is it that as Governors we can do to meet the emergency, other than to appeal to the Government? The Governors are just trustees for you and the Government.

There may be those who will say that the share of the cost paid by the student is too low—that we could make the student pay a larger share. That is a subject upon which I cannot enter to-day, except to say that any increase possible under existing conditions and existing ideas regarding the cost of education in Canada, would not help us very materially in our troubles.

It may be said that the State should limit the number of students in any one subject of instruction. It is technically

true that we could limit the number of students, but I only mention it to brush it aside; no one would for a moment consider it.

There are just three things that the Government could do: they could increase the fees, if the public would let them; or limit the number of students, if the public would let them; or pay the shot! (Laughter.) There is no other way that I can see.

I had occasion lately to thank a gracious lady for her gift to the University, and to speak of other gifts from private sources. There has been a rapid change in recent years in connection with the University and the Provincial Museum, showing a greatly increasing interest on the part of the wealthy people of our Province. There was never a time when the need was greater, or when the needs of the University should so strongly appeal to the benevolence of our wealthy citizens. The appeal I make to you, however, as business men of this Province is to support the University with your own opinion—if you will take the trouble to consider what I have said, and to read the report I have referred to—to support and hold up our hands in the good work being done in the University of Toronto. We need the good opinion of leading business men like yourselves in order to support our claims to sufficient aid from the State. What we want, to the last degree, is that the idea shall pass away that the University is some secluded thing, not in close touch with the life of the people. This Canadian Club is the most intellectual forum of debate in Ontario, out of which the best opinion arises; and what I want is to carry your opinion in favor of all the support that this Government, or any Government, may give to the University. It is the leading University, both in the number of students and in its importance generally, in the outlying parts of the Empire. It is distinctly one of the most important Universities of the world, and admitted to be such. It is the greatest thing we have accomplished in Ontario. It is the thing in all Ontario of which we have most reason to be proud. I care not what it may be, there is nothing else that so closely concerns the social, industrial and moral wellbeing of the people of Ontario as the University of Toronto. That being the case, I should like to have you feel some kind of personal proprietorship in it—you should have that! Shall it be hampered in its course by the need of money? Not if you will all hold up the hands of the Provincial Government in their renewed effort to provide what is necessary for the future work of the University. (Applause.)

(February 10th, 1913.)

Music for the People.

BY MR. ARTHUR FARWELL.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club held on the 10th February, 1913, Mr. Arthur Farwell said:—

Mr. President, Mr. Mayor, and Members of the Canadian Club,—It gives me very much pleasure to have the honor to speak to you on this subject which is so near to my heart, of "Music for the People" of our land. I think I can use that term, even if I was waked up this morning at an unearthly hour by an official demanding the keys of my hand baggage, for even if at the border we are reminded of our national differences, it is very fortunate that in many matters our interests are identical.

The subject is a great one, because more than ever before music has become a vigorous and universal art, and more than ever before, perhaps, the people have awakened and are eager to share in the finest and best fruits of modern civilization. Then again the message of music to-day is a great one. It makes for unity of feeling in the midst of our diversity, for joy, peace, uplift, in the midst of our strenuousness, and for the awakening of the spiritual nature in the midst of our materialism.

I do not know much about the condition of music as you have it here in Toronto. I know you have a world-famous choir, and a fine orchestra. The quickest way for me to deal with my subject will be to tell you what we have done in New York. There are general principles connecting music on the one hand with the mass of the people on the other. These principles are of practically universal application, if we can get down to them. So I will plunge right into the midst of New York music affairs, and tell you what is going on, first getting rid of mere data, which are somewhat of a nuisance.

The way in which the present movement started in New York was this: When Mayor Gaynor came into office, the matter of municipal music fell into the hands of commission-

* Mr. Arthur Farwell is Supervisor of Municipal Concerts in New York City. He is the chief living authority on Indian music of which he has re-produced a good deal. He is a writer and composer of note and founder of the American Music Society.

ers who seriously wished to advance it. The Department of Docks and Ferries and the Department of Parks are the ones under the auspices of which the public concerts are given, and these had money put in their hands to go ahead with music. Charles B. Stover was made Commissioner of Parks, and Calvin Tomkins of Docks. They had about \$100,000 from the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for the summer season of public concerts. They called in a committee of citizens; this had never been done before; in fact the work had not been done by the Commissioners in person before this, it had been taken care of by the aldermen. (Laughter.) The committee made certain recommendations, including the appointment of fewer leaders, and arranging for longer periods of service, so that the personnel of the bands could be better kept intact; also the whole was put in charge of a supervisor; that was when I came in. The aim was to take the whole matter off a political basis and put it on a musical basis. (Applause.)

So the activities began, and plans were made. There are several aspects of the work that I can cover quickly. In the first place, in the matter of appropriations: about \$100,000 was set aside each summer for a series of ten to fifteen or sixteen weeks; each Department was supposed to be given \$50,000 towards this amount. The aldermen were sometimes favorable and sometimes not, and on the degree of favorableness the size of the appropriation depended, being larger or smaller, but the amount was usually about what I have said.

The Dock Department has eight double-decked recreation piers under its control, where people can enjoy the cooler air from the North and East Rivers. There are band stands on these piers, and ample seating capacity, the docks being from three and four hundred to eight or nine hundred feet long. Concerts are given on the upper decks of these piers, which are used for all kinds of purposes through the day; the children play there, and there are refreshment stands; the concerts are given in the evenings. One of the piers now has an orchestral sound-reflecting shell, a recent improvement. Commissioner Stover has increased the number of music centres in the parks to about thirty-five, and they are located from the end of Staten Island to Upper New York, including the boroughs of Manhattan and Richmond, but not including the Bronx or Brooklyn.

We experimented with a symphony orchestra. We experimented with every kind of condition imaginable. As to bands and orchestras: there is really no such thing as a band in New

York; there is a musical union, composed of some four thousand musicians; a person engages a leader, and he goes to the union to get his musicians. As the union allows substitutes, there is a great deal of difficulty in keeping the personnel of a band intact. That is why we give longer engagements. The problem of establishing a permanent municipal symphony orchestra is one of the problems set for the future.

We have three orchestral conductors, Messrs. Arnold Volpe, Franz Kaltenborn and Arthur Bergh. The orchestras are of symphonic size. Orchestral music only is played in Central Park. There are two leaders there, who alternate week by week. Thus there is rivalry between the leaders, which helps to keep the standard up. One of the questions we are dealing with is that of orchestral shells. At Central Park Commissioner Stover has planned to put up a shell of magnificent design, which will probably go up this year. The Commissioner is trying to get \$60,000 worth of work done for \$40,000; he has got it cut to \$50,000, and will probably get the further reductions soon.

The number of concerts is about eighty per week, from ten or twelve to sixteen weeks in the summer. The summer before last we had about eight hundred concerts, one hundred of which were orchestral, the rest band. We have concerts on the recreation piers practically every night, if the appropriation is large enough, and at Central Park every night, and in other parks once a week.

The conditions at the different music centres are varied. One centre is in the Italian quarter; another in the Irish settlement; at Staten Island and other places there is a mixture, and so on. At Tottenville, on the extreme end of Staten Island there is an amateur band, and the farmers drive in from all around to the concert there. Our program policy is varied: from the start it has been to give the best things to the people, and let them become familiar with them. In smaller parks we have bands, and the repertory of the band is limited, so we cannot do so much; but where there is an orchestra, we give the people practically anything. The orchestral programs are semi-symphonic, ranging through Beethoven, Tschaikowsky, Mendelssohn, Wagner, etc. With the bands we give Italian opera nights, German, Slavonic, American nights, etc. Little by little we let the people become familiar with the world's best composers, expand their knowledge, so they have a bigger horizon. Of course on a Wagner night, I do not mean that it is a night of solid Wagner, but that the bulk of that program is Wagner; there is a cer-

tain amount of what you might call popular music of the better class, but not ragtime.

The attendance, taking the figures for the year before last, is about a million. Last summer it was undoubtedly greater, because we gave concerts every day at Central Park, instead of three times a week, and so we had the biggest attendance last summer.

One of the biggest features was the folk dancing for children on the recreation piers. There was a staff of instructors and folk dances; both European and American were taught. At the close of the season we have a folk dance festival in costume on the East 24th Street recreation pier, which is gaily decorated, and all the features are present which could make it a very beautiful occasion.

In all this system, as one is going on, one has very interesting experiences, and sees a good many things which are rather surprising. From the very first I saw many such things, and one was that there was nothing inherent in the common feelings of humanity or in great music that made these things necessarily separate. I have seen a leader, with a brass band of twenty pieces, play to a crowd at Barrow street that never heard of a symphony, both movements of Schubert's Unfinished Symphony, and receive a tremendous response. The players never knew what they were going to play till they got on the pier and saw the program. When we engage a good leader, he engages good players. The leader never thinks of telling his men what he is to play till he goes there. That is true of every band concert except the one where there is the amateur band. Not one of them ever rehearses, or needs to, for the kind of band program that is given. Many orchestral concerts are given without rehearsal, but we use all the rehearsals which the union allows.

On the other hand, we meet occasionally an experience such as we had with the "Gopher Gang" at Fiftieth Street, who hit the leader of the band with sticks, and told him to "cut out the good music"—"We're tough, and we want to stay tough," they said. (Laughter.) They were greatly afraid of becoming civilized.

At Central Park the whole city accumulates, from the east side to the west side, from everywhere they gather. They come in great masses even at 4 o'clock for the 8 o'clock concert. The attendance runs from five or six to fifteen thousand daily right along. On the recreation piers, the mothers and fathers sometimes send their children at 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon to hold seats for them when they come in the evening.

These colossal attendances at Central Park are given the very best programs, the great tone poems, and nothing of cheap "popular" music. And the bigger and better the music, the better the crowd likes it.

Now I want to give you a few deductions we have drawn from our experiences. First of all: an orchestra is absolutely fundamental: advance must be through the symphonic orchestra. What the great master music souls have had to say to the world, from Beethoven's day to now, they have said through the symphonic orchestra; it is concentrated there. We have great chamber music, and great choral music, but the great word for humanity in music has been spoken in the music of the symphony orchestra, from Beethoven to now. How, then, can we bring the greatest in music to the people without doing it through that medium. With the band you give a translation,—an adaptation. If you use a band, it bears about the same relation to the original thing the composer has to say as a photograph to an oil painting. So I say, there is no way except by centreing this movement in the symphonic orchestra, and bringing up the other musical organizations as well as possible.

The summer before last we had a million people attending the concerts. There were eight hundred concerts, seven hundred band and one hundred orchestral. But as to attendance, half of the total, or five hundred thousand people, attended the *orchestral concerts which were merely one-eighth of the total concerts*. So you see the tremendous influence of the orchestra. Old regime influences, political and otherwise, that in the past controlled municipal music, tried to work against the orchestra. But the test of the pudding is chewing the string, and when we see this tremendous influence of the orchestra, we have the answer to the question as to whether the orchestra is the thing to use. The people come to realize that, too. That is the first of my deductions.

The next is the question of the popular response to great music, the question of "uplift," as against "giving the people what they want." There is in reality no such question. It is all a matter of theory. "Uplift" is what someone thinks they should have, and that is theory. "What the people want" is what someone *thinks* they want, and that again is theory. We don't know these things. How do people know whether they want good music until they know what it is? Of course there is a response to the music of the hurdy-hurdy. If the people hear their familiar street music, of course they will respond. But that does not mean that they

will not respond ten times as hard to music which is ten times as great, if they hear it under proper conditions! (Applause.) That is true: we have found it so in New York. It is not a question of theory, of "uplift" or "what the people want;" it is a question of conditions, not theories. And the whole question resolves itself into one of horizon—what is needful is to expand the horizon of the people. The millions will respond, if they see what the world contains, and most of them are as appreciative, when you give them a chance to hear it, as anyone else. Music becomes to them not what they would call before "high-brow," but human, and they feel it. So we find them responding to the concerts in Central Park.

Let me read you one of the programs:

This one was given in Central Park under conductor Kaltenborn.

Berlioz—Rakoczy March.

Beethoven—Overture, Lenore No. 3.

Beethoven—5th Symphony—Last 3 Movements.

Liszt—Symphonic Poem—Tasso.

Herold—Overture—Zampa.

Mendelssohn—Andante for Violin Concerto.

Strauss—Waltz—1000 Nights.

Wagner—Song of the Rhine Daughters and Arrival of the Giants; Song of Bricka, Loki Passing through Nibelheim, and Entrance of Gods into Walhalla—The Rhinegold.

Wagner—Ride of the Valkyries.

Or listen to this one, conducted by Volpe:

Bach—Choral and Fugue.

Haydn—Finale—Symphony No. 13.

Mozart—Overture—Magic Flute.

Beethoven—Overture—Lenore No. 3.

Wagner—Prelude to Die Meistersinger.

Wagner—Wotan's Farewell and Magic Fire from Walkure.

Tschaikowsky—Overture 1812.

Wagner—Walther's Prize Song—Violin Solo.

Tschaikowsky—Waltz—from Sleeping Beauty.

Wagner—Ride of the Valkyries.

Such programs as that we gave frequently in Central Park, and as I say, they awaken the most colossal response from the people.

That is the second deduction or principle, that the people respond to great music with absolute spontaneity. But they **must know it**, and become familiar with it. The whole matter is one of practical demonstration, of steady practical pro-

gress in this, till you see the response there, and it comes quickly. We have seen in three days a change take place in the people's mind, bringing them from the old realm to the new, out of the mere fondness for brassy rhythm, mere noise, into the love of color—the manifold tone-colors found in orchestral music.

Coming to the third deduction—there is musical evolution with regard to *music*, and musical evolution with regard to *humanity*. There is a solution of the latter problem through what I may call the “mass-spirit,” that general something in a crowd which responds in mass to a thing to which there is no chance that any individual could possibly respond alone. The individual in a crowd responds very differently from the way the individual responds alone. I know very well individuals who could not be interested in a page of Beethoven's music, but put them there in a mass, in a great crowd, and their enjoyment is something tremendous. That is, if it is conducted by someone who understands it, and if the thing is magnificently done, as it must be. I call that the “mass-spirit,” the over-soul. It is the most responsive thing in the world. It seems to contain the same elements everywhere; the consciousnesses of all who are present rolled into one. A cross-section of it anywhere is identical with a cross-section of it anywhere else. It is a particular condition brought about under particular circumstances—a human thing. It is infinitely responsive. And it is that thing, and not a mental or educational idea, that we seek to reach. There is no actual knowledge of music in those people's heads, they don't know anything about it. It is through this channel of the mass-spirit that the great master minds speak to the people. They have not written to be forever studied, but to be heard, to appeal to the heart and soul of the people; and they are effectively heard only when you give the people the music under conditions where this mass-spirit can be awakened. This can be accomplished by persistence, and regularity, especially under gala conditions, making the affair a kind of festival, something pertaining to them—the people, so that their minds are made favorable to it. Thus, given a good conductor and good music, very favorable conditions for this thing can be brought about. So I speak of this mass-spirit as one of the most fundamental things: we cannot go forward without it—it will be only dry bones.

That brings me to the educational question. I am a believer in education; I am very grateful for the education I have received; but there are certain things that education

cannot seem to do. These people do not go to the concerts from the education they have received in the public school, or any other kind of education they have; they go because they are hearing music. Education is given, but we find it too slow; it is eternal; like the poor it is always with us, and ought to be. The Theosophists tell us that we go around in a circle of reincarnations on this low earth-plane until we have learned our lesson and are ready to be taken up onto a higher plane, at last being absorbed into Brahm or something of that kind. But with the people we short-circuit the educational process with a spiritual process, and we jump that bridge at once. (Applause.) And it works! Please don't think I have anything against education; it is one of the grandest institutions in the world. But the people get along without that in this matter.

We have begun to provide short annotated programs, with the meanings of the selections. All of that has happened, and the necessity of it has been felt, since the interest in the music itself was established. I think it was Schopenhauer who told us that the will precedes the intellect. And I think that intellect can often stand in the way of the real progress of the soul.

The last general principle is the matter of leaders. It is not easy to awaken the mass-spirit without having the right leaders. They must be competent to reveal the full spirit of the music. I have seen a bad leader give the most popular music imaginable to a crowd and awaken no response whatever; while a good leader would give a wholly unknown composition to the same people, and you would see them strongly responsive. So one can put it down as an axiom, that we cannot know, it is impossible to know, whether people will like a given composition until it is given to them by a thoroughly competent conductor. Under the old-time regime, when there were a good many politicians among the leaders, the result was not always what could be expected under proper conditions because the people will never respond to music when the leader has not been able himself to see anything in it. So it is a cardinal principle, that the leaders must be good: they must be musical, not political, appointees. (Applause.)

This mass-spirit, as I say, is very important in all this matter. I will indicate certain events in the United States which involve an appeal to it. In the United States some extraordinary things are happening. There is, for instance, the Forest Festival, or "Midsummer High Jinks" of the Bohemian Club, of San Francisco, which takes place at the

club's grove of giant redwoods, and presents original music-drama of Wagnerian proportions. And it has been created out of the community, by the community, and the community knows what it means; it is mixed up with the commercial life of the city; but that life comes into this spirit of the grove, which is almost like a cathedral, and feels its spell. It has grown up during the past thirty or forty years, out of a little lark in the summer, with music, into a great mythological drama, which through the art of poet and composer exalts this great crowd of San Franciscans to their highest appreciation of the noble presentation. No one previously dreamt that they could possibly accomplish such results; but it produces a spirit that is not only receptive but creative. Not only does the composer feel that mass-spirit, which he sees is greater than his little solitary studio moods, but through it he rises into a far higher creativity, and is lifted by this big vision far more than by his little aristocratic musical culture.

So also in the festival organized by Mr. Carl Stoeckel, at Norfolk, Conn. There is the spirit of music felt among all the people, and the man who drives you from the station will likely be singing Elgar's "Caractacus" to you the same evening. The same is true of the Bach Festival at Bethlehem, Pa. Then there is also the great movement for pageantry.

There is something in all these things which is bigger than the ordinary music festival, or than "Culture" with a capital "C." But superimposed upon this mass-spirit is a *something else*, something which gives *form* and local application to it. In ordinary festivals there are the quarrels between visiting orchestral leaders and local conductors; there are the artists brought there because of certain réclame; there is the local "society" aspect, far from the real spirit of music. But these things are different: they are born out of the community itself, and they all evoke the mass-spirit; but another element besides, which is just as important, and that is—*definition form*, a thing which takes this universal thing and brings it into definite shape. The Omaha Indians have a word for the Great Spirit, Wa-kon-da, meaning "the power, which goes forth, and *forms*." These newer activities are doing something far beyond those little aristocratic culture activities which have little to do with the life of the people. It is unkind to say hard things about culture, the result of centuries of effort; but there are times when we have to break out of it. Sir Hubert Parry says that when musical art becomes awakened through over-refinement, it always seeks new strength from the people. As it is now we have on one side

the little aristocracy of culture and on the other the great musically unregenerate mass of the people, that is supposed to know nothing about music, nor to be able to appreciate and understand it. Is it any wonder that a person reared in this atmosphere of "culture" becomes pessimistic? Some become philanthropic and take the "educational" position; others recede into the isolation of their over-refinement. The present-day culture-world of music is too smug, with its round of symphony orchestras, managers, artists and press réclame; it has nothing to do with the great big national issues that touch the soul of the people. The composers themselves are taught nothing about the great national issues—they are taught that a sonata should be constructed so and so; they go abroad and come back and write one symphony and go into oblivion. They get wound up on the bobbin of their own over-refinement, and lose the power to think bigly. The composer must break through that fatal condition, and this big movement is pointing the way to it. In the United States it has come to the point where a composer would rather accomplish a few bars of "atmosphere" in music, than compose the National Hymn! If he is not going to his ruin, he must stop, and blow his slug-horn, like Childe Roland at the Dark Tower.

The task that faces us in the future is to *form this mass-spirit*, through creative minds and souls bringing out the great thoughts and impulses of the people, and putting them before the people—through creating the people's own institutions and giving them to the people. We must take a step in evolution, and bring these things from the affairs of private citizenship to the municipality itself. In the United States this is really beginning to happen, and we are beginning to find out how best to do it. Local conditions of course will determine the forms to be used, whether they shall be concerts, or other forms, pageants involving music, etc.

I understand that here in Toronto you have much musical activity; I know only comparatively little about it. But you have certainly much to go upon. I thank you very much for the honor you have done me in asking me here to speak upon this subject. I wish you every kind of success in this movement, which I believe is tremendously uplifting to humanity to-day. (Long applause.)

(February 17th, 1913.)

Quebec, Its Early History and Development.

BY HON. DR. H. S. BELAND, M.P.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club held on the 17th February, 1913, Hon. Dr. Beland said:—

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,—I prize very highly indeed the honor of being your guest to-day. The pleasure I feel is not entirely unmixed with the sentiment of hesitation, owing undoubtedly to my inability to approach such a vast subject as that of the Province of Quebec, and also perhaps owing to my very incomplete and imperfect knowledge of your beautiful language. (Laughter.)

Though the part played by the Canadian Clubs all over this country is important in many respects, I do not know of any feature of their work which is more conducive to the building up of a true Canadianism than the bringing in contact of citizens of the widely spaced provinces of our beautiful Dominion. (Applause.)

As your worthy Chairman has said, I come from the Province of Quebec, from the old Province of Quebec, and from a remote corner in that old province. Lord Rosebery said at the Coronation luncheon given to the representatives from the Dominions that England was "an elderly lady." Well, the word indeed would well apply to the Province of Quebec, for she is an "elderly lady"; mind you, she was born some four hundred years ago! But I hope that the fact that she is old does not imply that she is lame and crippled. On the contrary, I think she is alive to the true idea of progress and betterment of mankind. (Hear, hear.)

Now, gentlemen, I was asked by your President to speak on the early history and development of the Province of Quebec. Indeed, in the space of the few minutes which are allotted to me it is impossible to go over this ground very completely. I will only, with your kind permission and indulgence,

* The Honorable Dr. Henri Severin Beland, M.P., sat in the Quebec Legislature from 1897 to 1902, and has ever since represented Beauce in the House of Commons. For a few weeks prior to the accession of the Borden Government he was Secretary of State in the Laurier Cabinet

try to impress you with some of the outstanding facts of the early history of the Province of Quebec. But let me say at the very outset that the history of the Province of Quebec is the history of your own country Canada (hear, hear); because at the time of the cession of Canada to Great Britain the Province of Quebec was the only thing in this country. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

I think it was in 1535 that Jacques Cartier undertook his venturesome trip to the new continent. Jacques Cartier came at four different times; and the hardships and the difficulties with which he and his companions were then confronted would compare, perhaps, only with those that have been encountered by this great adventurer and explorer of whom we have just heard, Captain Scott. (Applause.)

In those years, you must imagine that the facilities of transportation were very limited, indeed: sailing vessels only were available. The first time that Jacques Cartier came to the American continent he landed on the south shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and went right back. The second time he landed on the north shore; then he proceeded upwards as far as the place which is known as the small village of Montreal. (Laughter.) He came back and spent the winter in Quebec, where he lost most of his companions from that deadly disease known as *scorbut*, scurvy. He came two times after that.

Before the time of Champlain, in the 16th century, there was only one trading post established in the Province of Quebec; that was at Tadoussac, below Quebec. Then let us pass to the 17th century, and the first half of that century was mostly occupied by Champlain—Champlain, the founder of Quebec. There was nothing very important except renewed efforts for settlement, and continuous, almost perpetual, conflicts with Indian tribes. We well realize, we, who are Canadians and know all the beautiful aspects of this country, how the Indians must have felt, living in this realm with these beautiful lakes, these grand rivers, these forests replete with game of all kinds, we realize, I say, how reluctant they must have been to let the white man get hold and dispossess them as it were of this continent. So there were perpetual conflicts between Champlain and his men on the one hand and the Indian tribes on the other.

In 1608 he founded Quebec; he called it Stadacona. The next year there was an Indian raid. In 1610 there was another, and in 1615 another. These were resisted, always successfully resisted, by the French. In 1617, still in the first

half of the 17th century, he landed the first family of settlers, that of Louis Hebert. In 1620 Champlain built what is known as the Chateau St. Louis, which was the residence of our Governors up to 1834.

Then some important companies were formed for fur trading purposes. One of the most important was the *Compagnie des Cent Associés*, the Company of One Hundred Associates.

But it is not generally known that the Province of Quebec, or Canada, was captured in the 17th century by the English. We know that in 1760 it came under British rule, but it is not commonly known in our beautiful country that the Kirke Brothers took the Province of Quebec and held it for three years, from 1629 to 1632, a hundred and thirty years previous to the cession of Canada to England. Canada belonged to Great Britain three years, but it was rendered back to France.

During that first half of the 17th century Quebec was founded, in 1608; Three Rivers, in 1634; Montreal, in 1642; and also Sorel in 1643. These were the first four *bourgades* established in the Province of Quebec. And the first treaty of peace was signed between the Iroquois and Champlain, the Governor, I think, at all events with the French Governor of the time, in 1645.

Now about that time, 1650, you would probably be interested to know what was the population of Canada: it was about 2,500. (Laughter.) In 1660 there were 2,500 people in Canada,—about the population of the smallest town in the County of Beauce, which I represent. (Laughter.)

Let us continue. The second half of the 17th century was occupied by very big men, indeed. Frontenac, who came to what is to-day Ontario, and founded Fort Cataraqui in 1672, which is to-day the thriving and attractive little city or town of Kingston. And we have some great explorers, French explorers, in that second half of the 17th century; Joliet, Marquette, and La Salle, who desired to know more about this mysterious Western Canada. They went as far as the Mississippi River, and La Salle in 1680 was the first man that sent out on this beautiful Lake Ontario the first sail-vessel. Whether that vessel reached the spot which you now dwell upon, which you inhabit, Toronto, the history does not mention; but Lake Ontario was visited by a sailing vessel for the first time in 1680. (Applause.)

Frontenac and another French Governor, Denonville, carried on quite a few successful expeditions against the Indians.

The second treaty signed between the French and the Indians was in 1701. That is quite important. I mention these treaties only to remind my hearers that the Indians were not, as you know, men of their word; they would not keep faith; they would break their treaties, as they did the first time, because, for instance, a year or two after the first treaty was signed the Indians came in the night and burned Sorel. This was in 1701 that the second treaty was signed. There were also in the first half of the 18th century some English expeditions against Quebec.

In 1750 the population was 55,000 in Quebec, or Canada. Now we have reached that time in our history which some people know well and remember well,—remember, I mean, through their historical studies,—the period of the Seven Years' War, that is, the war in Europe, between the two secular enemies, France and England. That war was declared some time in 1756, I think. By that time there were south of the Province of Quebec, in what is known to-day as the United States-English settlements, as you all know. The war that was precipitated in Europe spread to the American continent, and the English-American colonies invaded the Province of Quebec. Armies also were sent from the Old Country, and you have all present to your memory the eventful days of the battles of Carillon, Montmorency, the Plains of Abraham, and Ste. Foye. We are all still filled with the remembrance of the valor and bravery of those English and French soldiers. Those deeds of theirs are couched in golden letters in Canadian history, and the city of Quebec has erected a monument to both heroes, Wolfe and Montcalm, (applause) stating that that monument was erected to their valor, to their fame, by history, and by posterity. The lot went against the French, Montreal capitulated, and the Province of Quebec, or Canada, was handed over three years later to Great Britain.

Now at that time there were 60,000 French in Canada; sixty thousand Canadians; and those sixty thousand Canadians produced, without the help of any important immigration, the wonderful population of two millions to-day! (Laughter and applause.) That is a fact that proves indeed more than anything I could say of the fecundity of the French-Canadian woman.

The first years of the English régime were indeed pretty hard for the Frenchmen. They were stripped of their civil laws, as you know, and were subjected to the arbitrary government of the Governor and his advisers. The Quebec Act,

eleven years later, brought relief to the Frenchmen. England was at all times, I think, a generous country. (Applause.) It was at all events in 1774, that the French were permitted the free exercise of their religion, and were also relieved of the oath of test, which was very, very objectionable to a man of the Catholic faith. Now, is it surprising that, a few months or a year after, when Washington issued a proclamation from the rebels in the American colonies to the French population of Quebec—is it wonderful that they resisted his appeal? Is it wonderful that when Lafayette and Rochambault, two French generals allied with the rebels in the United States, came to beg the French-Canadians to join the movement, they resisted? (Applause.) They resisted at that time as one man; and perhaps I might open a parenthesis here, and say that at all times since 1775, through all kinds of difficulties, and hardships, in the most gloomy days of their history, never did the French as a whole, as a population, try to secede from their allegiance to Great Britain. (Applause.)

You remember that at that time the Loyalists had moved from the United States into Canada; thus you had two populations, two races, in Canada, the French and the English. The English had settled mostly in the eastern townships and what is known to-day as the Province of Ontario. And that brought about the Constitutional Act of 1791, dividing Canada into two provinces, Upper and Lower, each provided with a constitutional government, but also the Governor and his Council were clothed with a good deal of arbitrary authority still, and there was witnessed a fight in each province between the House and the Governor and his Council. And that fight was carried on from 1791 till 1837, when it culminated in rebellion, led by French and English alike.

And that brings me to the report of Lord Durham, and that brings me to the Union, consummated, as you know, in 1841. The Union was imposed upon the Province of Quebec, and the Province of Quebec dreaded it; dreaded it because though it had the majority, a large majority, of the population, it was to have the same number of representatives in the United Parliament as the other Province. But after the Act of Union was an accomplished fact, the Province of Quebec, the Frenchmen, rallied to it, and their leaders at that time, one especially, Lafontaine, thought that the proper policy to follow was to unite with the English patriot Baldwin, and labor with him to secure the fullest measure of comfort and political development. (Applause.)

The population of Quebec in 1844 was 698,000. Now we have come to a day most important in the history of Quebec and of Canada, the time of Confederation; and your President, in writing me the invitation, asked me to give what had been the main reasons assigned for or against Confederation by the Province of Quebec.

Let me tell you immediately, the Province of Quebec never seriously objected to Confederation. The man who personified the aspirations of the Quebec population in 1863 and immediately before, was Sir George Etienne Cartier, and, as you know, he was a firm adherent of Confederation. Not only was he an adherent of Confederation, but he was an advocate of Confederation.

What were the main reasons he had for Confederation? First, he thought it was the only way of resisting annexation to the United States, which were at that date torn by civil war. The second reason assigned by Cartier was that it was the only proper way to establish permanently British Dominion on the northern half of North America. And the third reason put forward by Sir George Etienne Cartier, who spoke for the Province of Quebec, was that it was only by that confederated system that the privileges and aspirations of the Catholic population of Quebec could be secured and realized. Sir George was not in favor of a legislative union. Most of the politicians of Ontario were in favor of it, but they were brought by Cartier's convincing powers to favor a federated system; and the whole Province of Quebec rallied the following election to the policy of Cartier, only a few members being returned to the Confederation Parliament in opposition to Mr. Cartier.

Now the reasons assigned against Confederation by the Province of Quebec were not considered at that time weighty. There was more political opposition than real argumentative opposition. The Maritime Provinces were also taken into Confederation,—New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and a special guarantee had to be offered to induce them to join.

Now I have, I think, finished that part of my remarks which consists in telling you in as few words as possible and at long strides of the establishment period, from Cartier to the cession of Canada to Great Britain. I have also finished that part of my remarks which I would call the political part of our history, from the cession to Confederation. From Confederation to this day I would call the commercial part of our development.

I was asked to give you in as few words as possible the nature of the natural resources of the Province of Quebec. Let me tell you, Quebec, as any other country in the world, has, as its natural resources, land, water powers, forests, mines and fisheries. We excel in two: water powers and forests. Let me give you, for instance, something about our water powers: Quebec has 3,700,000 available H.P., in round numbers three and a half million H.P. available; out of that amount, 300,000 H.P. only is developed. These water-powers are mainly situated on the St. Lawrence, the Ottawa River, the St. Maurice River, the Saguenay, with their tributaries; others being on the Batiscan River, on the north, with the tributaries to Lake St. John, the Richelieu, Yamaska, St. Francis, and Chaudiere Rivers, on the south.

Now the other natural resource which is paramount, I think, in the Province of Quebec is the forests. I would estimate the forest wealth of the Province of Quebec at about 150,000,000 acres; out of which 111,000,000 acres are in forest reserves to-day. (Applause.) The total area of the Province of Quebec is 220,000,000 acres; so more than one half is forest, and almost two-thirds, perhaps more, of the forest is in reserves, and I think it is an admirable showing. (Hear, hear.) Indeed, the question of preserving our forests is a problem confronting Canada to-day, not only Quebec. Our forests have been depleted and denuded by very ill-advised cutting and exploitation. But in these reserves the Quebec Government's cutting is methodical, and if regulations are strictly adhered to as they are to-day the reserves are considered likely to be a perpetual asset. (Hear, hear.)

Indeed, if you consider that the water powers and the forests are the basis of one of the greatest industries of the age, the pulp and paper industry, I say that among all the natural resources of Quebec, if you single out two kinds, water and spruce, you will have not only one of the most important industries of Canada, but one of the most important in the world to-day.

Now, what about land? I have only four minutes left me. (Cries of "Go on.") The land of the Province of Quebec produced in field crops last year \$100,000,000 worth in hay, oats, potatoes, and so forth. The dairy produced \$30,000,000. The dairy industry is very thriving in Quebec; there are 3,000 butter and cheese factories.

Now I come to the mines. We give way before Nova Scotia and Ontario. The whole mining product of last year was about eight and a half million dollars' worth. But there

is one particular feature of our mining which I want to bring to your attention: it is the asbestos production. Quebec has the largest asbestos mines in the world, and produces 90 per cent. of the world's supply. (Applause.) There is only one other country in the world, that is Russia, which produces a very limited amount of asbestos, and of an inferior quality; whilst our asbestos, as you know, is of the very best quality.

As a manufacturing district the Province of Quebec stands second only to Ontario in our Dominion. With over 5,000 establishments it turned out over 300 million dollars' worth of products last year.

Commercial and technical education have received of late a great impetus from the local authorities, and I would invite you to visit our Commercial and technical schools in all our principal cities and towns.

Quebec has realized also that a highly perfected system of highways is the barometer of progress. A very progressive policy has been in force for a few years, and before a decade the province will boast of public roads which will be a credit to the whole Dominion.

Now I think I have come to that part of my remarks, when I should conclude. What is the greatest asset of the Province of Quebec? ("People," said some.) Some of you think it is the French-Canadian woman! (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Not at all! She is indeed charming and precious; but the greatest asset of the Province of Quebec, and for that matter of Canada, is the great waterway, the St. Lawrence River (applause), especially when you think that one-third of the whole Canadian trade is borne on the bosom of the St. Lawrence; when you think that eight hundred ocean-going vessels have plied over its waters last season; that it is at the head of ocean navigation, and at the foot of inland navigation. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Canadian Club, it is beautiful, it is useful, we could not do without it! As you sail up the St. Lawrence from the Gulf, and as you curve in from the channel south of the Island of Orleans, what do you see? You behold that imposing rock of Quebec, that rock which was the advanced sentinel of France for three centuries, and which is to-day the advanced sentinel of Great Britain and has been for a hundred and fifty years. Around that rock and on top of it and behind it is the solid, sturdy, frugal population composed of the French-Canadians! (Applause.)

I was asked by your Chairman to try to outline what was the part played by the Province of Quebec in rounding out Confederation. Well, I do not know that the Province of

Quebec has played any particular rôle, but if it has it is that it has by the conservatism of its population helped to exercise what I would call a restraining influence, a discouraging factor, against any demagogic practices of some other countries in the world. Its population has for a hundred and fifty years been attached to the British Crown. And I don't know of any power in the world, demagogic or otherwise, that would induce the French population to sever their connection with the British Empire. (Applause.)

(February 24th, 1913.)

Municipal Taxation

BY MR. LAWSON PURDY.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club on the 24th February, Mr. Purdy said:—

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—When I come to a Canadian city, it almost always is the case that I am obliged to say that Canadians have advanced farther and more wisely than the United States. I have the same thing to say to Toronto. In many respects, tax laws in Canadian Provinces are superior to tax laws in American cities. One reason for your advance has been the fact that you have not hampered Canadian Provinces by constitutional restrictions to such an extent as in almost all the States of the American Union. Our early constitutions generally were short, simple, and did not impose restrictions on the power of legislative bodies, for they were along very broad lines. But commencing about seventy years ago the States of the West began to attempt to control many matters of detail in their fundamental law, and then made it very hard to change that fundamental law. So changes in taxation have been comparatively slight in most of the cities west of the Rocky Mountains. But even in the United States we have seen during the last twenty-five years a slight movement going on that is going on in most of the European countries, in Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada; the effort in one way or other is to relieve the burdens upon the consumers as such, upon wage earners, upon the poorer classes of the community, and to impose heavier burdens upon privilege in one form or other, and upon accumulated wealth.

That tendency has worked out in different ways in these countries. Thus in Germany it mostly finds expression in income tax laws, in taxes upon unearned increment off land when sales tax place, and to some extent in taxes upon inheritances. In Great Britain it furnished one of the chief points of contest in the last election; it was carried out to a somewhat minor extent in the budget which is known as the Lloyd

* Mr. Lawson Purdy is President of the Department of Taxes and Assessments in the City of New York.

George budget. In New Zealand and Australia they have more and more relieved the masses from taxation, and imposed heavier taxation upon land values. In the United States we have ratified an amendment to our Federal Constitution, and will shortly have an income tax for Federal purposes; and various States have more and more developed inheritance taxation; and all these methods have had their motive in the imposition of heavier burdens on those who have been the recipients of privilege, and who for one reason or other have accumulated great wealth; and so gradually the burden has been shifted somewhat from the poorer classes of the community on to those who have enjoyed such privileges.

In Canada, I need hardly tell you here, in the Western Provinces you have been trying experiments which have appealed to many in the United States, and which we have found difficult to follow because of constitutional objections. In relieving improvements of taxation they are practically relieving the farmers of the Western Provinces of all taxation, and imposing taxes upon ground values, a social product. In this Province there is a strong sentiment for going in the same direction, and it seems very probable that the next few years will see the same kind of change (applause) take place in the Province of Ontario that has taken place already in the Provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and I believe to a certain degree in the Province of Manitoba.

In the United States we have advanced somewhat in the same direction through improvements of administration. I remember very well, only seventeen years ago, or eighteen, appearing with a committee before the Mayor of the city of New York, who had been elected on a platform of law enforcement, and asking him to direct the Assessment Department to enforce the law in the assessment of real estate. The law then required real estate to be assessed at its full value, but in practice in those days it was assessed on the average at about 60 or 65 per cent. in the old city of New York, but there was great discrimination. Land as a rule was not assessed fully as compared with buildings, and vacant land was on the average much under assessed. In those days the assessment was set down on the assessment roll in one lump sum, and it was somewhat difficult to analyze it and find out how much was on land and how much on improvements. The spokesman said to the Mayor: "Your Honor, you are pledged to the enforcement of the law; and we have here tables showing great discrimination in the assessment of real estate, not so much of properties of similar kind, indicating special

favoritism, but as between classes of property there is great discrimination; land is not fully assessed; we have a great many instances of vacant land not assessed at more than 20 per cent. of its value, and improved property is assessed at 70 or 80 per cent. of its value. We trust that you will correct this, by directing your Assessment Department to assess all property at its full value." The Mayor was a very nice old gentleman, but one who had had no experience, the result of one of those popular movements to "make a business man Mayor." (Laughter.) He said to us: "Do you mean that land in the northern part of the city, of which you have spoken, ought to be assessed at its full value?" We said: "That is what the law says." He said: "That would be awful! Why, those people would have to sell it." (Laughter and applause.) I think the Mayor correctly expressed what was the ordinary sentiment throughout the city of New York eighteen years ago. And, needless to say, he did not give any direction to the Assessment Department to do what we asked him to.

In these eighteen years there has been a complete change of public opinion. I don't mean that the opinion of everyone is changed; but the average opinion is now against any discrimination as between classes of property under the law as it is. Not but that there is an active sentiment in favor of changing the law in the direction in which it has been changed in some of the Western Provinces of Canada. But the sentiment, under the law as it is, is almost unanimous in favor of equal enforcement.

Since I have been in the Assessment Department it has been a common thing for men who are developers of real property to come to me and say: "I think your assessments are low on such an acreage tract. I have tried to buy it, for so much, and your assessment is not as much as that, and I could not buy it." I don't say that to discredit the work of my own Department. One of the most difficult things to do is to get evidence of the value of vacant property when there is no activity in the real estate market. Assessors must always follow the evidence of value, they cannot precede it. When it happens that there have been no sales in a certain territory for a time, the assessments are advanced as fast as seems practicable, but must sometimes fall behind the actual increase. The point I wish to make, therefore, is, there is a sentiment among those dealing in real property and who are developers, in favor of assessment without discrimination in favor of vacant land such as there was twenty years ago.

The administration of the law has improved in many American cities. In the city of New York the improvement began by the ordering of a separate statement of the value of land in the assessment of real estate, so the assessments could be compared more easily with one another. Methods of publicity have been devised. Land value maps are published showing the value per front foot of lots 100 feet deep, so anyone can compare values of land in any part of the city with values in any other, and judge if the assessments are properly made, and if not, criticism may be effective. That same policy is being imitated by other cities of the United States.

With that tendency to assess land value fully and to impose heavier taxes upon land than upon improvements, there is a tendency intensified which always exists: there is always a pressure upon the owner of valuable land to put it to that use which will yield the greatest return, and as taxes increase that tendency is intensified; there is the more necessity for suitable regulation to prevent the rights of land owners from being infringed.

In this country, and when I say that I mean North America, we were brought up from our earliest colonial times with a strongly developed idea of personal liberty; and often we have lost sight of the fact that to protect men's liberties there must be good legislation, to prevent their liberties being infringed upon by the license of their neighbors. The countries of Europe, including Great Britain, have been more alive to the necessity for protecting men's rights from the license of their neighbors in many ways than we have in the United States and Canada. The result of that carelessness may be seen by any of you who visit the city of New York. It saddens me every time I walk along the streets in certain sections of Manhattan, to see what ruin is being wrought by the fact that we do not regulate the height and style of buildings, and the area which may be covered. (Applause.) For a good many years men have been alive to the fact that public health was in danger from overcrowding, and that the beauty of our city was liable to be destroyed, and they have made appeals on the ground of beauty and public health for the regulation of buildings. Unfortunately these appeals have fallen upon comparatively deaf ears when they have been addressed to land owners, and with us land owners are a very potential power in legislation. They are here. They are throughout this country. The appeal has not been made to them sufficiently that their own interests are left unprotected so long as their neighbors are given license to do what they please.

As President of the Department of Taxes and Assessment I sit on the Review Board of Assessments. During the last seven years I have passed personally on probably nearly fifty thousand applications for reduction of assessment values. I am somewhat familiar therefore with the reasons alleged for requests for the reduction of assessments. You would be surprised at the number of cases where the reason for reduction is that light and air has been shut off by neighboring buildings. Probably all of you know something of the Island of Manhattan and the territory south of Brooklyn Bridge, where we have our highest land values and office buildings. We have allowed men to erect office buildings just as they pleased. They have gone up twenty, thirty, and now forty or fifty stories in the air. A few years ago a building twenty stories high overtopped all its neighbors, and the tenants of that building had splendid light, air and view; rents were satisfactory, and income return ample. Presently, owing to the enormous land value that grows from the right to erect a twenty or thirty story building (applause) the neighbors were obliged to erect similar buildings; the first one was blanketed, its light and air was gone; its tenants left to go into some building where they could get light and air, and from which they could see something; the rents fell; and then we would have an application to reduce the assessment because there was no light and air. (Applause.)

Because we have allowed such buildings to be erected, the land values along Broadway and a few parallel streets, and a few cross streets, are enormous. Near the corner of Broadway and Wall Street there are corner lots worth a million dollars for 25x100 feet, while within two or three hundred yards there are lots not worth \$25,000. This license to erect buildings has concentrated values on these few streets. That has been in the interest not of all those who owned land on Manhattan Island, but of only some of the owners on those few streets. Had we years ago limited the height of buildings, as is done in London, Berlin, Paris, Frankfort or Munich, we should have no \$25,000 lots left, and we should have no million dollar lots. There would not be the congestion of population through the day that there is now, but the people would be spread out more evenly. There would not have been three-fourths of the population working by artificial light during the day; and the streets would not be so congested that you could hardly walk in the direction opposite to that which the crowd takes when going down in the morning or back at night. (Applause.) It is practically impossible as a finan-

cial matter to provide adequate walking room for the enormous population of our office buildings in some of the few streets through which they must travel south of Chambers Street. (Hear, hear.)

I have taken my illustration from that part of the city of New York with which probably all of you are familiar. I could give you many others. I have a special grievance myself with the conditions on Forty-Second Street. Near the Grand Central Station, to which most of you go when you go to New York, if you walk west on Forty-Second Street from the station, you come presently to Fifth Avenue, and see that superb new Public Library, appropriately set back from the street,—a work of art of which any city might be proud! (Hear, hear, and applause.) But you look on the right, to the north of it, and you see a building, oh, fifty or sixty feet wide, with a fairly decent façade, and a great blank wall on the side, no finish! That building will stand there, an eyesore, for probably forty years; it is twice as high as it should be,—fronting on that beautiful avenue, in front of that Library! If buildings should be erected of equal height, the value of that building would be seriously depreciated. To-day it is hogging the light. It may be profitable, but it has spoiled the appearance of all that street!

If you go south a little way, you come into what we call the loft zone. A few years ago some architect unfortunately planned a loft building, twelve stories high, or about 125 feet high on a 60-foot street; and other buildings 90 feet deep have been erected on lots 100 feet deep, leaving a distance between buildings of only 20 feet. The first loft building there was successful: it had light on four sides; it was profitable. But when another building was erected at the rear, only 20 feet away; another on the east, and another on the west, on this 60-foot street, its light and air was gone; and now we have applications for the reduction of assessments on these loft buildings.

In those streets on lower Fifth Avenue and the cross streets the congestion is such at certain hours that the people are attempting to relieve it. There is a serious plan to have the luncheon time of the employees arranged so that they will not all go out on the street at once, (laughter) but start at half-past eleven, and go in attachments every five minutes till two o'clock, because the streets are not wide enough to let all the people out of the buildings at once to get a little light and air! The thing is horrible! The whole appearance of the city is spoiled, and millions of dollars are wasted! (Applause.)

I have been discussing this thing mostly from the standpoint of those that own the land. I have a few words more to say about it. It is too late for us to do what we should have done on Manhattan Island: it is not too late for us to deal with our suburban territory. Ten years ago we made an advance in the matter of tenement house regulation. Prior to that we allowed 90 per cent. of the land on which a house stood to be covered by the building; and we had the most terrible congestion of any city in the world: most of the rooms were dark, many had no windows. We did the best that was then legislatively practicable. (Laughter.) We reduced the area to be covered by a tenement from 90 per cent. to 70 per cent. of the lot; the building must be a certain distance from the rear of the lot, and farther and farther from the rear of the lot with every additional story. We allow six stories of semi-fireproof building. Even allowing these buildings to cover 70 per cent. of the lot, is a great deal better than the old style. But do you know, there is hardly a city in Europe that allows tenements which cover over 50 per cent. of the lot? (Applause.)

People who own outlying land, in the boroughs of Brooklyn, Queen's, the Bronx, and Richmond, want you to allow people to go from the congested centres, and make new congested centres on their land! (Laughter.) You can't congest the whole borough of Queen's: it contains 129 square miles; if we allow tenement houses in Queen's that cover 70 per cent. of the land, it is not possible for every one of the land owners of Queen's to have a congested centre on his farm.

If now we will limit the area which the building may cover to, let us say, 50 per cent. of the lot, and if it be not more than four stories high, just as an illustration, why there are half as many again of the land owners of Queen's who will get something out of it, perhaps twice as many. It will be more in the interest of the greater number, to have the people not huddled together in a small space, but spread out a little thinner. Now this is so everywhere; it is true in the business section, and it is true where there are to be residences.

May I commend to you here, in this great growing city, that is still in a condition such that you can regulate it in time, (applause) to look at the pictures, if you have not seen them, of German cities, and read the regulations as to buildings which have made those cities what they are. They are developed along lines of beauty because of utility. (Applause.) They are not allowing people to be herded together too closely. They are not allowing men to erect buildings that destroy the

light and air of their neighbors. They are applying what I believe is the correct principle to city building, the principle which is necessary to protect the rights of all; (hear, hear, and applause,) and that principle is, that no building should be allowed to be erected which impairs the right of other owners to the equal improvement of their property. You should not have a building erected such that the entire territory suitable for that type of building may not be completely covered with buildings of the same size, and still be suitably improved. (Applause.)

This is a practical program, simply in the interest of all the people, including the land owners. And then, besides that, it has a tremendous appeal to everyone who has any concern at all for the health, morals, and well-being of the whole people that are to live here in the future! (Long applause.)

(March 3rd, 1913.)

The Cost of Living.

BY MR. C. C. JAMES, C.M.G., LL.D.*

AT a regular luncheon on the 3rd March, Mr. James said: *Mr. President and Gentlemen*,—We are told that Artemus Ward had a celebrated lecture with the simple title, "Milk." He was asked to go to a Western State to deliver his lecture, and agreed to do so. He sent on his subject, "Milk." They wrote back and said the subject would not do, though the lecture might be all right. He said, "Call it anything you like, but you will have the same lecture!" The position is a little different to-day. The subject has been assigned to me, and the officers have told me I can say anything I like about it.

If you touch the pockets of the people you will have them all interested. The pockets of the people of Canada have been and are being touched. (Laughter.) I think there is no subject more popular, more frequently discussed, more interesting, or one that has been settled more frequently, than the subject of the high cost of living. You will notice on the cards the subject is given, not as "the high cost of living," but as "the cost of living." I venture this remark, that at least one-half of you in this audience are better able to-day to pay the prices of food products than you were ten or fifteen years ago. (Hear, hear.) To you, then, it could not be a question of high cost of living, but of the cost of living. There is a class, however, who would prefer to take this as a question of the high cost of living. Men on fixed salaries,—clergymen, teachers, professors, members of the Civil Service—this will appeal to some who are at the head table at least,—clerks,—I think perhaps no body of men in Canada to-day are feeling the effects of the high cost of living more than those to whom I have referred. Others are able, more or less, to adjust themselves, and to them it is a question whether the high cost of living is a cause or an effect.

* Mr. C. C. James, C.M.G., LL.D., who for many years was Deputy Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, retired a year ago to become Special Agricultural Commissioner for the Dominion. With Hon. Martin Burrell he is working out the Minister's scheme for the expenditure of \$10,000,000 in the next ten years in promoting agricultural education and stimulating agricultural production throughout all the provinces. The result should be an increase of profits for the farmer and cheaper food for the consumer.

I presume I have been asked to speak on this question, not with the expectation that I shall settle it, or exhaust it, but that from the agricultural side I may say something of interest to you. It is a many-sided question. If your Club wished to discuss it fully, you would have to have a symposium, which would occupy a whole afternoon or evening. For instance, you would have a financial expert, who would tell you what has been the effect of the increased output of gold upon market prices. The Provincial Engineer of Good Roads would tell you what a very close connection good roads have with the question. Some man like Sir Horace Plunkett would tell of the benefit of co-operative marketing and co-operative purchasing. Dr. Adam Shortt would tell you of the good and bad sides of combines and mergers, and what their effect is for good or ill upon production and food prices. J. J. Hill would tell you that the high cost of living is due to the cost of high living; but you would not need Mr. Hill to come here from the Western States to tell you what you can prove out of your own experience, right in your own family. The Editor of *The Toronto World* would lay stress upon the high transportation rates on the railways. The Postmaster-General would explain how he would help to solve it with cheap parcels post. The Editor of *The Globe* would declaim upon the woeful waste of war and the economies of peace. (Laughter.) And if we dare venture upon political ground, some people not far away from us might venture some remarks upon the effects of low and high tariffs. It is a complicated question! I have given you nine or ten contributing causes, all of which play some important part.

Now I wish to add one important item, the question of supply and demand, that which I think the simplest, and which would give the most satisfactory explanation of the present situation, and which regulates prices the world over.

In the ten years from 1901 to 1911 the population of Canada increased very nearly two millions, the figures being 1,833,523. The city, or urban, population increased 1,258,645; leaving a rural increase of only 574,878. And that rural increase was more than made up by the rural increase west of the Lakes, for Canada east of the Lakes suffered to the extent of 47,253, while the rural population west of the Lakes increased by 622,131. Thus, while there has been an increase of over a million and a quarter in the towns and cities of Canada, there has been a decrease in the old agricultural provinces; but this has been more than made up for by the increase west of the Lakes.

What have these people been doing who have gone on to the farms of the three Western Provinces? Raising wheat, oats, flax and barley. They have not yet become mixed farmers; they have been producing from their fields articles which have in the main been exported. There is a marked contrast between the wheat and flax-growing farmer in the West and the farmer in Old Ontario, producing a great variety of food out of his soil and stock. In the early days of this country, in addition to food products the farmer was producing articles of clothing, and a great deal of material for furnishing of his house. These he now gets from the towns and cities. What does it mean? You cannot draw a line between producer and consumer simply by consulting the tables of the Dominion Census. While we have added a million and a quarter to our towns and cities in ten years, all consumers of course, we have also added six hundred thousand people to the rural population of the West, who in one sense are producers, but who are also consumers on a larger scale. If you examine the situation from this standpoint you will at once see that the consumers of Canada have been increasing much more rapidly than the producers. In that way you can settle why we are still moving up in the prices of our products.

Just two examples, one from the extreme west, the other from the extreme east. The Province of British Columbia imports no less than fifteen or sixteen million dollars' worth of table products every year; and New Brunswick, generally looked upon as agricultural, is compelled to import no less than four million dollars' worth of food products every year!

Had we time we might take up one by one some of the suggestions I have made: the gold production, the question of the extension of good roads, marketing, co-operation, and so on. All of them are important and worthy of separate consideration. But we must confine ourselves to the consideration of the question from the standpoint of supply and demand. If the demand is increasing so rapidly, it is a matter of prime importance to the people of this country that something shall be done to increase the products of the farms. (Applause.) And that instruction should be given to show the farmer how he can produce more, to perfect him in that production, and show him how he can produce more economically. That is the basis of the Burrell Bill recently introduced into the Dominion House of Commons, to set apart \$10,000,000 to be spent on instruction in agriculture during the next ten years. If you will allow me I will tell you something of how this money is proposed to be spent.

Some people said this Bill was designed to rectify all the ills arising from the high cost of living; but when you understand that there are at least nine or ten elements entering into that question, you see that any man would be foolish who made any such claim as that by giving instruction to the farmer you were going to solve the whole question. This Bill aims to give instruction to the farmer, so that he can raise more products, better products, and do so more economically. It proposes to do this along three different lines.

It first proposes to place at the disposal of the Provincial Departments of Agriculture sums of money whereby they can send to practically every farmer and every farmer's family upon the home farms the best instruction in farm methods. There was a time when instruction was limited to the four walls of a building, the schoolhouse and the college. In the training for the professions where expert instructors are engaged and laboratories are well equipped students will of their own accord come seeking instruction. But in the case of agricultural work, more is necessary: you must send the instructors out to meet the farmer and give him instruction upon his own land.

The second line of operation is this: money is placed at the disposal of the various Departments of Education to help them to introduce agricultural instruction in connection with the public schools. (Hear, hear.) These two lines, I think, commend themselves to any intelligent man who is interested in the rural community, and also in the community at large.

The Bill up to this point involves instructors, teachers, agents, experts,—whatever you may call them,—and therefore it is laid down specifically, or we are trying to lay it down specifically, that the third great object shall be to enlarge and increase the efficiency of the schools of learning, or agricultural colleges, out of which must come the instructors.

Now let us see, for a moment or two, how this is working out in the various Provinces of Canada. We have already made a start, and if the agricultural industry and agricultural interest continues to grow in the next ten years along the lines initiated in the past six months, I think we shall have gone a long way in helping to so solve the question before us to-day.

We start at the little Island of Prince Edward, where the people have for so many years been quietly working and living contentedly, losing their population in a steady stream to the eastern cities of the United States, and also to the great

West, plodding along in the old way, apparently satisfied: but they have at last shaken themselves free of that, and are looking on agriculture as their great provincial work; and it will not be very long before Prince Edward Island will be standing out as one of the most progressive Provinces in the whole of Canada. They started out on new lines this last year. They had little with which to work. They first procured an agricultural hall; they had to have some place in which to hold meetings. And they have just closed the first of a series of short courses, with a registration just a few short of five hundred! (Hear, hear.)

We cross over to Nova Scotia; what have they been doing? They have the only Agricultural College in the Maritime Provinces, at Truro. Knowing the great need of men, they have resolved to extend and enlarge that institution, and have taken the first year's appropriation to add to the buildings and equipment of their Agricultural College. Their plans for this year call for extension of work in dairying, live stock, poultry and horticulture—carrying instruction in these lines to the farmers.

Next comes New Brunswick. From this appropriation they are able to put out special instructors in horticulture, dairying, and also domestic science; they are starting Women's Institutes; they are erecting two agricultural schools, one at Woodstock, and the other in the town of Sussex; and they are about to appoint an Agricultural Instructor or Director for their schools.

In Quebec, they are using a demonstration train, to enable the people to realize the benefits that can come from instruction along right lines, simply a stimulus. They have been increasing the equipment of their French agricultural schools, and extending the work of Macdonald College, using this money to extend its influence among the English-speaking people of the Province.

We come to Ontario. Here this appropriation is being used along every line to stimulate and extend the work, providing more instructors in many different lines, extensions you could not have had otherwise, enlarging the many phases of the work with which you are more or less familiar. A field experimental building is being erected at the Agricultural College. The staff of permanent county teachers is being increased. The horticultural work is being extended. Field work is being undertaken in the poultry industry. Pure-bred stock is being sent into Northern Ontario. And provision is being made for instruction of women on the farm.

Manitoba sent out no less than two demonstration trains through the Province to stimulate the farmers. The authorities are now planning to have a corps of instructors go out and visit the new settlers as they come in and direct them along lines of work which the older farmers of Manitoba have found successful. They are planning extensive demonstration farm work to encourage mixed farming.

In Saskatchewan the operations are limited only by lack of men. They are extending various lines of instruction, and have written to us, "We need men!"

In Alberta three agricultural schools will be completed in another month or two, costing \$30,000 each, to be centres of instruction in rural districts. Each will be in charge of an instructor of agriculture who with his staff, will direct, supervise, and encourage agriculture in the surrounding country. Seven schools ultimately are planned, but three are now being erected.

In British Columbia again the cry is for men. They have great agricultural problems, which they are trying to solve as best they can. As I pointed out, that Province imports annually \$15,000,000 worth of food products. They feel the necessity of development, but they want men to act as instructors. They are making plans for a large agricultural college, and for instructors to take charge of districts.

So you see, through having money, it is possible to accomplish, from the extreme east to the extreme west, a great deal for instruction which could not otherwise be attempted.

What about Toronto, and the cost of living here? This is something that comes right home to everyone of us. We have a city here, ambitious, progressive, coming soon to the half million mark. You know what are the local conditions here in Toronto as to roads, markets and market gardens. But suppose we had a city with a perfect system of radial electric roads, running from the heart of the city out to the producing sections of the surrounding country; and supposing we had in all the suburbs around Toronto a host of market gardeners, producing the things we need upon our tables; and suppose we had first-class roads, highways, coming into the city; and suppose we had public markets in various parts of the city, where the house-wife could go with her basket and buy vegetables and garden products direct from the producer's wagon; would not that have some effect in lowering the cost of living in the city of Toronto? (Applause.)

Then why haven't we got these now? Why is it, that when you go to Europe, and see a city of half a million, you make a comparison between your home city and that one, and say, "How is this? The people of these old countries of Europe have these facilities, in which we are utterly lacking at home?" Why have we not got these things? Is it possible to get them? And if we did get them, would it not have a very material effect in reducing the cost of living? In those Old World cities, there is another thing I would refer to. You find in many of them what are known as Colony Gardens. I don't know of any in America, such as are to be found at Copenhagen, Denmark, for instance. As you come to the suburbs you find a tract of fifteen or twenty acres all cut up into small plots, and on each is a little house; the land is cultivated; in each house is living a family. How is this brought about? The city leases or buys a large block of land, cuts it up into little lots, and says to any of its citizens: "At a minimum rate, as long as you remain a citizen, you can have use of this to grow vegetables and help to keep down the cost of living."

Let me make brief reference to the question of co-operation. This includes production, marketing, and buying. We have heard more of co-operative production than of co-operative consumption. We are trying out on a limited scale the principle of co-operation in connection with production, but hardly have reached the starting point in the matter of buying. We can hardly expect to import the methods of Denmark and Belgium and Germany, and apply them to the people in this country, because we are not Danes or Belgians or Germans; we have been living along different lines; and any methods introduced will have to be adapted to our people and our conditions to be successful.

Have we any co-operation in the city of Toronto in buying? At first, perhaps, we would say "No." And yet the water in that glass, if it came from the water tap, is the result of the biggest scheme of co-operative buying to be found anywhere in the world! Why have we a municipal system of waterworks? Simply because it is cheaper and better for all the people to co-operate in the purchase of water than to leave it to the individuals. The individual well and the town pump have given place to the co-operative water system.

We have just taken the next step, in the co-operative supplying of light. And just as soon as the inventors can solve the problems connected with it, we shall add the co-operative

supplying of heat, and it will not be long before we have water, light, and heat supplied to our homes by co-operative effort, a co-operation embracing all the consumers of the city.

Why stop there? Why should we not go a step or two farther, and see our homes supplied co-operatively with the half-dozen things necessary for sustaining life? For instance, why not have our milk supplied that way, and cut off all this overlapping? We say the municipality shall be responsible for the quality and care of the milk brought to us; why not go the whole length, and put down at our homes the bottle of milk with the co-operative municipal tag on it?

I suppose if I mentioned other things, I should be called a Socialist! I would be quite willing to be put in the class of Socialists, if in some way it could be arranged that the half-dozen necessities of life could be supplied to all our citizens at cost, or a small figure above cost! (Applause.)

We do things in this new world, and then sit down and are surprised at some of the results. We put many millions of dollars into a railway to open up the cheap lands of the West, and then wonder why the people are leaving the land here. We keep on doing it, opening up new areas every year, and our people follow in the great rush to add to the acreage of wheat and oats and flax, and we wonder why the price of living in the city keeps up! As a people we should just sit down and do some thinking. Instead of spending twenty-five or thirty million dollars opening up land in some remote section, which is not yet required for use, would it not be better to build good roads in the settled sections? We could increase the population living in the country and assist in making the people living in the country happier, and would go a long way towards solving some of these questions now perplexing us, by cheapening the cost of production and of marketing. (Hear, hear.) I can remember, when a boy, going every Saturday to the market, where the farmers' wagons were backed up against the walk; the farmer and the farmer's wife were there; I was able to carry away the things I bought in the basket, or if they were too large, the farmer was asked to deliver them; the consumer was buying from the producer. Now when you want a bag of potatoes, you go to the telephone—that is the first charge!—and you call up your butcher; he probably supplies you with potatoes bought from the commission merchant on Front Street; where did he get them? From an exporter in New Brunswick who got them from a local agent, who went through Carleton County, and took them up from the farmer, who got

30 to 40 cents a bag for his potatoes. There is a big question there, not only for you in Ontario, but for the people of the West, how to get rid of the middleman! We have no right to call him names: he is earning an honest living: it isn't the fault of the middleman, it is the system that is expensive, and if we can change it we are able to add not only to our comfort but to the farmer's. The farmer is not getting a cent too much, when he is getting four cents for his milk, but you are paying too much when you are paying nine and ten cents for it! (Applause.) The question is, what are we going to do about it?

I have not time to refer to the question of cheap money. I would like you to read the speech of Mr. Arthur Meighen, M.P., delivered in the House of Commons on the 12th of February, appealing for the farmers of the West, asking that the Government provide agricultural credit in order to make it possible for them to borrow cheap money to enable them more rapidly to introduce mixed farming. The Government of Saskatchewan has recently published an instructive pamphlet dealing with this matter.

I trust, Mr. President, that in the presentation of this question, while I did not aim at solving it, I may have said or suggested something to help us to clear thinking, because if we do not think right, we are not likely to act along effective lines." (Applause.)

(March 10th, 1913.)

Canada and the Navy.

BY HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club held on the 10th March, Hon. Mr. King said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—When my friend, Dr. Colquhoun, said to you that he labored under the difficulty of having been a personal friend of mine for a number of years, he had in mind that friendships often beget difficulties; in fact I sympathize with him, because I find at this moment my difficulties arising out of the circumstance that I have many personal friends in this audience, who are political opponents, and I have a knowledge of the purposes of the Canadian Club, and am anxious in the course of my remarks not to offend my friends even in argument, and to keep within the lines of the Canadian Club addresses.

I feel some relief in the mention of the circumstance that Mr. Meighen is to speak to you next week. Mr. Meighen will doubtless speak from one point of view, my point of view will be the other; at the same time I should like to deal with the subject allotted from the standpoint of broad, national considerations, irrespective, if possible, of party politics. But I am afraid I see national considerations somewhat in the light of the view taken by the party to which I belong. However, I shall try to direct your attention to certain phases of the subject without laying special emphasis on the one party point of view.

I will not go into the question as to whether an emergency exists or not, or as to whether the issue has arisen out of party exigencies. All that kind of argument can be left to other places and times, but I would like to raise one or two questions of another kind for your careful consideration.

First, what are the obligations of a Ministry in the matter of carrying out a line of policy dictated by a resolution of the House of Commons? I should like you to consider that, wholly irrespective of the question at issue at the present moment. We all know that when a statute is enacted Parlia-

* The Honorable William Lyon Mackenzie King, C.M.G., P.C., was Minister of Labor in the Laurier Cabinet. He is a fair example of a young Canadian who has risen to high position by his own efforts.

ment expects the people of Canada to obey its provisions. When a resolution of Parliament sets forth a line of policy does it not devolve upon the Ministry of the day, no matter what its political complexion, to carry out the line so dictated? I would like to raise that question in your minds, and will leave it to constitutional lawyers to answer it.

So long as a resolution is on the records of Parliament requiring a Ministry to do a particular thing, it seems to me the Ministry should either carry out that resolution, or cause the resolution to be rescinded, or appeal to the people with another line of policy, giving reasons for the change of policy. But so long as a resolution remains, I think the Ministry should be bound by that mandate. I hope this is not a controversial question. It may be that a Canadian Naval service is going to be Mr. Borden's policy at the present time. But that raises another point for consideration which is, that no Ministry should leave room for doubt as to what is to be its permanent policy. I think every Ministry on a question affecting the future of a country and possibly the Empire as a whole, can not come out too much into the open, or make too clear its policy in its every bearing, and disclose every important consideration in connection with the policy which it presents.

The next point I ask you to consider is the obligation imposed upon a nation from the point of view of national honor, of carrying out agreements and undertakings which it may enter into, or which may be entered into, if not in a formal manner, at least in a manner which at the time gives reason to believe that the obligations assumed will be discharged.

As I think everyone knows, the decision to establish a Canadian naval service was unanimously arrived at by the House of Commons in March, 1909; and as a result of this resolution a conference was held in England in the summer of 1909 with members of the British Admiralty and representatives of other self-governing Dominions. A Conference on military and naval defence, a subsidiary conference of the Imperial Conference, was summoned by His Majesty's Government to consider, what the outlying Dominions should do in consequence of the unanimous resolution of the House of Commons of Canada, of a similar resolution from Australia, and of an offer of naval assistance by New Zealand. Representatives of all these countries met, and a copy of the proceedings sets out the work of that conference. Just to refer to one clause: the Admiralty in announcing the forthcoming

conference, said it was called "to determine the form in which the Dominions could best participate in the burden of Imperial defence."

The conference was called with special reference to Canada, and the proposals of New Zealand and Australia. Briefly the results were: Australia was to begin a naval service of her own; Canada was to begin a naval service of her own; New Zealand was to adopt the plan of contribution to Britain of money, in return for which Britain was to furnish ships to be placed in New Zealand waters. Australia was to begin the best naval service she could along the lines suggested. The Canadian Government was also to begin the construction of the best naval service it could along the lines agreed to by Canadian Ministers in conjunction with the British Admiralty. No one thought of anything else, when the Conference was over, but that this Dominion would proceed forthwith and make a beginning in the organization of a Canadian Naval Service. You may take whatever view you please as to the wisdom of the course decided upon; that is open to debate: I admit that there are arguments to be urged for centralization in defence, but while I admit this, there is, I think, more to be said in favor of co-operation. But the point is, this country undertook in conference with New Zealand, Australia, and the British Government, to do a particular thing, and arrived at a conclusion unanimously. Is there nothing in the nature of national honor which helps to bind this country to the carrying out of that particular obligation?

Only a few weeks ago, press despatches came from the Australian office in London, saying that Senator Pearce, Minister of Defence of Australia, objected to Australia being represented on any Council in England, which was consultative and advisory only, as the Government of Australia did not see any advantage to be derived therefrom, and the despatch went on to represent the Australian Minister as saying: "When we entered upon the policy of having a naval service of our own, it was agreed that Canada was to do the same. We would like to know how is Canada going to carry out her part of the undertaking?" There is a consideration which affects the honor of this whole country! It may be Mr. Borden's intention ultimately; but I say no Ministry should leave any doubt for one moment as to the intention of Canada to fulfil her part of any undertaking entered into. You cannot make a united Empire if you leave room for doubt and quibbling. It is important that this be made clear in the interests of the whole Empire.

I may say Australia has carried out the policy agreed on. She began in the fall of 1910 and in September of last year, King George himself gave the royal impress of approval to that service by allowing it the title of "The Royal Australian Navy." There is a naval service started by Australia herself, under the control of the Australian Government, and the King of England to-day gives his approval to that service. When we discuss this question, that surely dismisses at one stroke the kind of argument that would suggest that a Canadian naval service means separation. If a country like Australia does not fear in having a navy of her own that her loyalty will be called in question, surely it is belittling the high position of the people of this country to let a suggestion be uttered from any side that in having a naval service of her own Canada's loyalty will be called in question!

I may mention further that this Royal Australian Navy has received another mark of endorsement from high authority. Let me read one paragraph from the Memorandum from the British Admiralty on the General Naval Situation presented to Parliament in December last. Section 7 says:

Further, at the present time and in the immediate future, Great Britain still has the power, by making special arrangements and mobilizing a portion of her reserves, to send, without courting disaster at home, an effective fleet of battleships and cruisers to unite with the Royal Australian Navy and the British squadrons in China and the Pacific for the defence of British Columbia, Australia and New Zealand. And these communities are also protected and their interests safeguarded by the power and authority of Great Britain so long as her naval strength is unbroken.

Look at that paragraph! In the first place, it disposes of all idea of an emergency. Great Britain can "without courting disaster" send ships out of her waters to go to the defence of other parts of the Empire. But I want to direct the attention of my fellow Canadians throughout this Dominion to another aspect: we are told that the defence of our country is dependent upon the Royal Australian Navy; that British Columbia must look to the Royal Australian Navy in considering its defence! Would we not as Canadians feel a little prouder if there were a Royal Canadian Navy to safeguard the defence of our own coasts, and to go to the assistance of Australia in time of need? Canada dependent on Australia! I say it is time, if we in this country want to

continue to boast of our greatness as a nation, that we should remove a reproach of that kind, and begin to build up a service of our own, which could co-operate with other services of the Empire in going to the assistance of any part in time of danger.

The third point is a question I have not seen much discussed, but it seems to me one for Canadians to consider: have we—this is a question for constitutional lawyers—have we authority, have we power, under the British North America Act, to legislate on any matter of defence for parts of the British Empire other than Canada? Do not let me be misunderstood: the Parliament of Canada can vote a sum of money for any purpose it pleases, granting an emergency, as in the South African War; but if the intention is to plan something as a permanent part of the country's work, you have to consider the limitations of the British North America Act. Section 91 says: "It shall be lawful for the King, with the advice of the Senate and the House of Commons to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada," in relation to certain specified matters, which include militia, the military and naval service, and defence. The point I would make is this: it seems to me that the Bill before the House of Commons at the present time, the proposal which the Government has brought down, goes beyond that. The British North America Act, at the time it was framed, did not contemplate the legislating on matters beyond Canada altogether. The Bill brought down does not have relation to the "peace, order and good government of Canada," but to "the peace, order, and good government of the Empire." That purpose may be right enough. It may be, Canada should work to that end. But I contend that before that step can be taken, with due regard to the Constitution as it is to-day, we ought to get the powers of Parliament enlarged in a way to enable us without any doubt to legislate in that direction. I believe, if you study what was in the minds of the men framing the British North America Act, you will find that they did not think they were framing a constitution for the Empire, but for Canada. It might be that a broader constitution is now necessary; it may be that we shall have a constitution for the Empire some day—I am one who hopes to see a development in all that pertains to the welfare of the British Empire—but I do not believe that the development will be helped by taking an unauthorized step in advance; by working out an Imperial constitution by breaking our own! Let us begin by educating the people of

this country to a sense of the possibilities of this wider field of action. But if we want to enter this wider arena, let us first obtain the power, so we can legislate on matters beyond our own Dominion. An Imperial Statute might confer on the Canadian Parliament the necessary powers, or an Imperial Parliament might enact the necessary legislation. But the B. N. A. Act as it stands, is, as its name implies, an Act relating to British North America, not to the British Empire.

The difference is brought out in the titles of the two measures. The Act of 1910 was an Act "respecting the Naval Service of Canada," the Bill at present before Parliament is entitled "A Bill to authorize measures for increasing the effective Naval forces of the Empire." You can make a Canadian naval service as efficient as you like, and do as you please respecting it, as long as it is controlled by Parliament; but when you begin legislating in a broad way upon the naval affairs of the Empire, it seems to me you are going beyond the powers of the Constitution. I may be wrong, but take your minds away altogether from the question of the navy, and apply this thought to any other question—immigration for example, and it will become apparent that the British North America Act never contemplated going outside Canada even as respects the naval power and authority of Britain.

As we study the present proposals and see what they involve the wisdom of the limitation upon our legislative authority will become apparent. Mr. Borden in 1910 moved a certain amendment, to ask Parliament to vote a contribution of money or of ships to be placed at the disposal of the British Admiralty, I think he emphasized rather that money be given. Let me say, I agree with the principle absolutely; if there is an emergency, give money to the people who need it, and let them spend it in the manner that will best meet the situation. But the emergency does not exist: there is no doubt about that, and the ground has shifted from the idea of a gift to the question of ownership. To-day the proposal is not to give England money or even to give ships outright, but ships, which the one who gives shall own, and yet not be responsible for. The proposal is to make to England what looks like a gift, but in reality only places at her disposal certain instruments of war which we shall own.

Thirty-five million dollars is proposed to be spent on the three most powerful battleships in the world, but the ownership of them is to remain with Canada. That raises questions we cannot disregard, one of an ethical nature: it is pro-

posed to build the three most powerful battleships that science can build or money supply, and Canada is to own them: is that the ideal we should place before this young nation? At this stage of our National development is that the means we propose to take of inculcating ideas as to the part which Canada is to play in furthering ideas of world peace? It is a tremendous responsibility to foist upon a young industrial peace-loving nation the ownership of the three most powerful engines of destruction in the world; let us begin in a modest way, not seek to surpass the nations of Europe, Germany, France, Britain and all the other nations on earth in our paraphernalia of war. I say we should have a higher ideal than that! There are other ways of helping the Empire! My mind does not run in the lines of war; my mind runs rather along the lines of peace. (Applause.) And what is going to help best to maintain peace. If this were an age such as the Middle Ages, when society was organized on a militarist basis, it might be different; but we shall, I hope, find it better for a young community, in this age of industrialism, to seek other ideals than outrivalling the world in battleships. I think it points in the wrong direction. We hear spread-eagleism sometimes condemned: there is just a little too much of that sort of thing in the suggestion that we should possess the three largest of anything in the world!

Then as to ownership. If this proposal is carried out, we are to own the three largest battleships in the world, but are not to control them; we are told that they are to be placed in the battle line of the Empire; we don't know where, but at any rate, they will not be under the control of the people or the Parliament of this country. You cannot divorce ownership and the object owned; this country is to remain owner of these three mightiest instruments of war, and its Parliament at the same time is to have absolutely no say as to what shall be done with them. Mr. Borden says we should not take any part in Imperial wars until we get a voice in Imperial affairs. That is good sound logic. But what Mr. Borden is proposing, is the very thing he says should not be done. By placing at the disposal of the British Admiralty three of the largest ships of war in the world, we are irrevocably drawn into every conflict of the Empire into which these ships may be brought, and yet shall have absolutely no voice in the policy responsible for the outbreak, or for any situation which may arise. It is quite conceivable that England, through her alliances may be

drawn into conflicts in Europe or elsewhere, or on account of her understandings with Russia, France, and other Powers. The three largest battleships are likely to be kept in the war zone wherever it may be. If England, not of her own accord, but because of her understandings with other Powers, should get into a conflict, then these vessels, which Canada owns, would be at once precipitated into that struggle. Isn't it conceivable, that England might not wish to have her outlying Dominions drawn into such a struggle? Yet we certainly would be, with the ownership of those ships, and their identification with this country by the names given them.

What is further involved in the proposal? With the rivalries of armaments in Europe, England has realized that it would be a relief to be freed from part of this stress of competition. Within the last little while she has made overtures to her neighbor across the Channel, saying, "If you go on building battleships we will go on, but if you stop we will stop." That proposal is beginning to bear fruit. But what is the suggestion now? These three greatest instruments of destruction are to be in addition to any program Great Britain may deem sufficient, in other words we are precipitating into the European situation something tending to complicate it: we are provoking the very kind of trouble which it should be the highest duty of statesmanship to avoid! These are questions I think we as Canadians cannot be indifferent to.

If we are making a gift, it should be a gift outright. Let England own the ships and be responsible for her policy, and for whatever may be the outcome of her action, respecting the property she owns. But when we give a thing and still say we own it, how is it to do credit to either party to the arrangement? Certainly I should not feel very proud were I to meet an Englishman in London and know that in his mind was the thought, "A loyal people you are! you say you give us three ships and yet say you own them!" It is not dignified. It is not worthy of Canada, either let us give the thing outright, or else keep it and take responsibility with ownership!

The question of the advisability of making so radical a departure from the course all along pursued in defence is another point to consider. Canada at Confederation had to choose between contribution and maintaining her own forces for land defence. The suggestion was made that the country pay for its defence by contribution, but the Fathers

of Confederation said, "No, we will undertake to spend at least a million dollars a year on our own militia; Britain may send troops in addition if she thinks we need troops." She did and maintained garrisons at Halifax, Quebec, Winnipeg, Esquimalt and elsewhere. In the Red River rebellion, one-third of the force was British. In the Northwest Rebellion many of the officers were British, the rest were Canadian. Then came the war in the Soudan, and it was proposed that Canada send troops; but the Government of the day said, "No, we are under no obligation to send men to take part in the wars of European nations." That was not because of disloyalty. No man will say that Sir John A. Macdonald was not a loyal British citizen. But it was because Sir John believed, that Canada should determine the part she would take, and could see no obligation upon this country to participate in that war that he refused to permit it.

We have greatly relieved England of the obligation of defence. Esquimalt and Halifax, the last of the British garrisons in Canada, have been taken over by the Canadian Government, and Canada to-day is the only part of the British Empire on which the British Exchequer is not spending money specifically for defence. In the case of Australia, the United Kingdom is still contributing out of her taxes for ships to be placed and maintained in Australian waters. In the case of New Zealand, the British taxpayer pays in part for ships to be placed in her waters. The same is true of defence in South Africa. Don't think for a moment that England is doing nothing for us to-day. We owe everything to England, and cannot do too much in return where the need exists. But we shall not make ourselves more loyal Britishers or Imperialists by being untrue to what we have done ourselves. Canada has met out of her own treasury for sometime past the whole expense of defence on land. What defence on sea may be needed will come in time. There are at present no ships stationed in our waters. England is paying for none, we are paying for none; why should we not begin to meet any need by extending the obligation of defence already assumed, from defence of land to defence of the coasts by a naval service? Why not extend to sea along the constitutional lines laid down by the British North America Act in respect of which there can be no question, the obligation of defence which we have so well assumed, and so well carried out on land?

How has the assumption of our own defence on land worked out in the interests of the Empire? During the South African war we were able to send fully equipped regiments of infantry, cavalry and artillery, which rendered splendid service on those distant battle fields. Do you think if at that time we had had a system of contribution, and we had had this country filled with British troops, this young nation would have been able to respond as she did? If that has been the history of land defence, why not look forward to a future equally satisfactory in naval defence? To my mind, the glory of the British Empire and its true greatness will lie in the fact that when the Mother Country fears danger at home she will not have her anxiety increased by the thought of the insufficient protection of her outlying Dominions and possessions, but will gain a sense of new security in the knowledge that in the North Atlantic, and the South Pacific, in whatever quarter of the globe her Dominions are, from thence will arise to meet any threatening power, the might of the young nations in their newly acquired strength, rising as it were out of the several oceans of the world, each in the pride of its own national spirit, and all enthused with the ardor of sharing the common glory of one Crown and one flag! That, to my mind, gentlemen, as a young Canadian, is the ideal of defence towards which we should strive in the British Empire! (Applause.)

Think what it was a few centuries ago, in the time of the greatness of the Roman Empire. Rome with her centralized powers had her governors send back to Rome the taxes of her subject peoples. The Roman Empire has disappeared and passed into history. Contrast with that the scene at the Coronation of King George V. familiar to us all. From Canada, Australia, Newfoundland, New Zealand, South Africa, came, not the appointed proconsuls of Britain, but the elected representatives of these young free nations, not with taxes grudgingly given by dependent peoples, but to assemble around a newly crowned Sovereign and tell him how he might maintain his throne in security by ever seeking to preserve the liberties of his people. There was a picture of empire the like of which this world has never hitherto known. In this work of Empire building, we must choose frankly between increasing centralization, and, in the words of Lord Milner, establishing "new centres of strength." If we build up a strong Australia, a strong New Zealand, a strong Canada, and a strong South Africa, then with a strong United Kingdom we may not have the most

highly centralized machinery of destruction in the universe, but we shall have a group of communities, loving liberty because enjoying liberty, loving freedom because sharing freedom, and a bulwark of defence of freedom stronger and more far-flung than anything hitherto known, and, in this united strength, the greatest agency for peace, progress and the furtherance of righteousness among men and nations this world has ever known. (Long applause.)

(March 17th, 1913.)

Dr. William Henry Drummond: Poet and Man.

By MR. THOS. O'HAGAN, M.A., PH.D.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club held on the 17th March, Dr. O'Hagan said:

Mr. President, and Members of the Canadian Club,—I assure you that it is in no conventional manner that I express to you the great pleasure I have in being present here to-day as your guest. Living under alien stars I have not, I hope, lost my love for my native land, and while I have been treated with the utmost kindness by the people of the Republic to the south, yet my heart travels back in memory and gratitude to the land where I was cradled.

You will be pleased to know that in Chicago we have organized a Canadian Club. (Applause.) Not only, Mr. President, have we nearly all the cities of Canada represented there by their own Canadian Clubs, such as the Belleville Club, the Kingston Club, the London Club, and the Stratford Club, but we have one united organization, formed a little more than a year ago, and it is succeeding admirably. Of course you understand that there is a difficulty which you have not here, because it is easy in such surroundings for men to forget that they are Canadians; but I am pleased to say they do not do it. Yet it is difficult to hold them together, because of the fact of their environment. We have pleasant quarters, and we get speakers, sometimes Toronto men, such as Mr. George Tait Blackstock, who delivered an address at our annual dinner last year, and we had Sir Mackenzie Bowell, that veteran Canadian statesman, whom we caught "on the fly" while passing through Chicago; also Mr. Villeneuve, President of the Cartier Club of Montreal. We had hoped to get Sir Wilfrid Laurier, too, but they are so busy at Ottawa that he could not come. I understand that so many of the politicians are "at sea" there that they are preparing to become admirals when the Navy is launched! (Laughter.)

* Mr. Thomas O'Hagan M.A., Ph.D., is a Canadian Poet, Essayist and Journalist, who for some years has been engaged in Journalism in Chicago.

Well, all these things are extremely encouraging. A man said to me one day, "By the way, you Canadians are very ambitious." "Yes," I replied, "and we deliver the goods!" "I believe you do," he answered. So Canadians are occupying very prominent positions in the commercial world over there, in the industrial world, and even on the stock exchange. (Hear, hear.)

I think I have a certain right, by the way, and privilege to address a Canadian Club, for I was a charter member of the first Canadian Club established in Canada. This Club was organized in Hamilton in 1892. (Hear, hear.) I was then Principal of a High School hard by, and they invited me to join the Club, because they knew I was deeply interested in everything Canadian, and I attended the first annual banquet and replied to the toast of Canadian literature. The next year I was a graduate student of Cornell University, and was invited by the Club to read a poem at the annual banquet. So, my Canadian brothers, I can assure you that I feel at home with you. (Applause.)

Now, I am to speak to you to-day upon the life and work of one who was a guest at your tables, who broke bread with you, and holds a place of large esteem in every Canadian heart—I mean Dr. Drummond. Of course it is impossible to give an account of the man or of his work as a poet without taking notice of the form in which he wrote most of his work. As regards dialect poetry, in the broad sense of the word it means the language spoken by a section of the people, in contrast with that spoken by the whole people. When you go across the line to the Republic in which I have been living for a few years, you will find a good deal of dialect poetry has blossomed from the soil, a good deal more than in our own land. The reason is, that there is great localization and differentiation there, but in our own country of Canada localities are not so sharply differentiated. There is quite a difference between the language of the people of Vermont or Indiana and that of those out on the Pacific coast; but there is not much difference between the Nova Scotia man and the British Columbian, and there is but little difference between the Provinces of Manitoba and Ontario, save for the wider vision of the prairies and the stronger ozone that one breathes there. But there is one part of Canada where dialect poetry has blossomed, for there are the conditions for its growth, the soil and the atmosphere, and that is in the home of Bateese (Baptiste).

There you find a people living a quiet, ideal, beautiful, peaceful life, a life reaching back to the old regime, untouched by the torch and the trumpet of the French Revolution, faithful to the religion of their fathers and to the Curé. Surely people living this ideal life would be fit subjects for poetic characterization. When Dr. Drummond found these people he discovered a field for dialect poetry. He went amongst them with open and sympathetic mind, ever ready to find the fragrance of virtue where the flower grew. It is easy, my good friends, to ridicule a people, but it requires genius in touch with the lowly and divine to gather up the spiritual facts in a people's lives, and give these facts such setting that poet and people shall live forever. Dr. Drummond has done this.

I remember well being his guest three times, and on one occasion I said to him, "I am exceedingly glad to know that you are big enough, honest and sympathetic enough, not to have ridiculed these people." He replied, "I would rather cut off my right hand than ridicule these people!" That was the kind of man he was! (Applause.) Dr. Fréchette, in pointing out how Dr. Drummond does not ridicule the people, says he paints them as they are, as a Millet would, or a Jules Breton. His point of view is always spiritual. In the broad sense of the word, it is neither earthly nor intellectual but always spiritual. Therefore Drummond's judgments have about them something of the accuracy of heaven.

Now I shall say something of his work. Later on I shall touch on the man as I knew him. Taking up his work, as to the chronological production of his poems, the first poem which brought him fame was the well known little poem, "The Wreck of the Julie Plante." It has been recited everywhere in the lumbermen's camps of Michigan and Wisconsin, by the cowboys out on the plains, and by the members of the exclusive clubs of New York and Boston. Dr. Drummond could almost be said to have awakened one morning and found himself famous when he had written the "Wreck of the Julie Plante."

As to the origin of the poem: the St. Lawrence, as you all know, expands some distance below Montreal into Lac St. Pierre, which like all small lakes is subject to violent storms: in one of these occurred the wreck of the "Julie Plante," a little wood scow. The humor of it lies in the high dramatic key in which it is narrated: never did ocean liner, not even the Titanic, go down to its grave amid such footlights of tragedy as sank "the Julie Plante" in the waters of Lac St. Pierre. I will recite the poem for you and so let the author tell you the story.

THE WRECK OF THE "JULIE PLANTE"

A LEGEND OF LAC ST. PIERRE.

On wan dark night on Lac St. Pierre,
 De win' she blow, blow, blow,
 An' de crew of de wood scow "Julie Plante"
 Got scar't an' run below—
 For de win' she blow lak hurricane
 Bimeby she blow some more,
 An' de scow bus' up on Lac St. Pierre
 Wan arpent from de shore.

De captinne walk on de fronte deck,
 An' walk de hin' deck too—
 He call de crew from up de hole,
 He call de cook also.
 De cook she's name was Rosie,
 She come from Montreal,
 Was chambre maid on lumber barge,
 On de Grande Lachine Canal.

De win' she blow from nor'-eas'-wes',—
 De sout' win' she blow too,
 W'en Rosie cry "Mon cher captinne,
 Mon cher, w'at I shall do?"
 Den de Captinne t'row de big ankerre,
 But still the scow she dreef,
 De crew he can't pass on de shore,
 Becos' he los' hees skeef.

De night was dark lak' wan black cat,
 De wave run high an' fas',
 W'en de captinne tak' de Rosie girl
 An' tie her to de mas'.
 Den he also tak' de life preserve,
 An' jump off on de lak',
 An' say, "Good-bye, ma Rosie dear,
 I go drown for your sak'."

Nex' morning very early,
 'Bout ha'f-pas' two—t'ree—four—
 De captinne—scow—an' poor Rosie
 Was corpses on de shore.
 For de win' she blow like hurricane,
 Bimeby she blow some more,
 An' de scow bus' up on Lac St. Pierre,
 Wan arpent from de shore.

MORAL

Now all good wood scow sailor man
 Tak' warning by dat storm
 An' go an' marry some nice french girl
 An' leev on wan beeg farm.
 De win' can blow lak' hurricane,
 An' s'pose she blow some more,
 You can't get drown on Lac St. Pierre
 So long you stay on shore.

This being the 17th of March, and I bring the evidence with me in this shamrock which I wear, and many of you being of Celtic extraction—either you or your parents having been born and cradled in the land beyond the sea—I think it only proper to refer to the Irish character of Dr. Drummond. He was a Celt to his finger tips, and proud of his race. Many a time he expressed to me in his own drawing room his love for the Irish race. The last poem he read at a banquet, a few weeks before his untimely death, I want to read to you because it voices the loyalty of the man to the blood in his veins. He was twelve years old when he came out to this country. The poem, "We're Irish Yet," was written in the spring of 1907, a very short time before his death. This poem, the last one that Dr. Drummond ever wrote, was read by the author at a St. Patrick's Day banquet in Montreal in 1907.

WE'RE IRISH YET.

What means this gathering to-night?
What spirit moves along
The crowded hall, and touching light
Each heart among the throng,
Awakes, as tho' a trumpet blast
Had sounded in their ears,
The recollections of the past,
The memories of the years?

Oh! 't is the spirit of the West,
The spirit of the Celt,
The breed that spurned the alien breast,
And every wrong has felt—
And still, tho' far from fatherland,
We never can forget
To tell ourselves, with heart and hand;
We're Irish yet! We're Irish yet!

And they outside the clan of Conn
Would understand, but fail,
The mystic music played upon
The heart-strings of the Gael—
His ear, and his alone, can tell
The soul that lies within,
The music which he knows so well,
The voice of Kith and Kin.

He hears the tales of old, old days,
Of battle fierce by ford and hill,
Of ancient Senachie's martial lays,
And race unconquered still.
It challenges with mother's pride
And dares him to forget
That, tho' he cross the ocean wide,
He's Irish yet! He's Irish yet!

His eye may never see the blue
Of Ireland's April sky,
His ear may never listen to
The song of lark on high,
But deep within his Irish heart
Are cloisters, dark and dim,
No human hand can wrench apart,
And the lark still sings for him.

We've bowed beneath the chastening rod,
We've had our griefs and pains,
But with them all, we still thank God,
The Blood is in our veins,
The ancient blood that knows no fear,
The Stamp is on us yet,
And so, however foes may jeer,
We're Irish yet! We're Irish yet!

I have spoken of Drummond as being a Celt to his finger tips; and he had all the characteristics of the Celt. I don't mean to say here, my friends, that the Irish possess all the virtues. There is no *best* race! Not at all. But there are certain races that stand for certain ideals. And I know you will agree with me when I say that no race stands so distinctly as the Celtic race for spirituality. It is the pride of the Celt in every land that he has never given way to atheism and infidelity: he always leans upon Providence; and whilst you will find him brooding over wrongs, you will always find the spiritual element strongest in his character.

Dr. Drummond was a clean-souled man. Let me quote you Dr. Symonds' word: "I believe great men are Sir Galahads. Their strength is as the strength of ten, because their hearts are pure." Dr. Symonds, Dr. Drummond's pastor, paid him the tribute that if in any company where he was any story was told that was not becoming the lips of a clean-minded man, Dr. Drummond got up and left the company in protest. (Applause.) What a beautiful tribute from his pastor!

Then the tenderness of the man, and his love for his mother, were marked characteristics. We were very close in friendship, and at his death Mrs. Drummond asked me to write an estimate of the man and his work. I was very pleased to do that,—I was delighted to do it, because I loved the man. There is a strong friendship between men; nothing is so lasting: you know the bond of friendship is strong. All down the centuries it has been strong; so when I learned of his death I mourned. People wept over Drummond's death as they did over John Boyd O'Reilly's who passed away in Boston a few years ago,—regardless of race, for we

all love a great man. Drummond was full of tenderness, as shown in his love for his mother and for little children. Now I am going to read you at the close what I think is a gem: it was too sacred to be published when he was living; it touched a sorrow too deep; it was on the death of his little child, a beautiful child. I was away in Europe at the time, but I remember this little boy as one of the most beautiful I have ever seen. He reminded one of the picture by Murillo of "St. John and the Lamb." When the child died, it broke Drummond's heart. He himself called the poem he wrote, "The Dream," but I see in the volume published after his death, containing all his works, it is called, "The Last Portage." It was not published in his lifetime, and now, with your permission I will read this little poem:

THE LAST PORTAGE.

Las' night w'en I'm sleepin' I dreamed a dream
 An' a wanderful wan it seem—
 For I'm off on de road I was never see,
 Too long an' hard for a man lak' me,
 So ole he can only wait de call
 Is sooner or later come to all.

De night is dark and de portage dere
 Got plaintee o' log lying ev'rywhere,
 Black bush aroun' on de right an' lef,
 A step from de road an' you los' you'se'f,
 De moon an' de star above is gone,
 Yet somet'ing tell me I mus' go on.

An' off in front of me as I go,
 Light as a dreef of de fallin' snow—
 Who is dat leetle boy dancin' dere,
 Can see hees w'ite dress an' curly hair,
 An' almos' touch heem, so near to me,
 In an' out dere among de tree?

An' den I'm hearin' a voice is say,
 "Come along, fader, don't min' de way,
 De boss on de camp he sen' for you,
 So your leetle boy's going to guide you t'roo;
 It's easy for me, for de road I know,
 'Cos I travel it many long year ago."

An' Oh! mon Dieu! w'en he turn hees head,
 I'm seein' de face of my boy is dead—
 Dead wit' de young blood in hees vein—
 An' dere he's comin' wance more again,
 Wit' de curly hair, an' dark-blue eye,
 So lak de blue of de summer sky—

An' now no more for de road I care,
 An' slippery log lyin' ev'ryw'ere—
 De swamp on de valley, de mountain too,
 But climb it jus' as I use to do—
 Don't stop on de road, for I need no res'
 So long as I see de leetle w'ite dress.

An' I foller it on, 'an' wance in a w'ile
 He turn again wit de baby smile,
 An' say, "Dear fader, I'm here you see—
 We're bote togeder, jus' you an' me—
 Very dark to you, but to me it's light,
 De road we travel so far to-night.

"De boss on de camp w'ere I alway stay
 Since ever de tam I was go away.
 He welcome de poores' man dat call,
 But love de, leetle wan bes' of all,
 So dat's de reason I spik for you
 An' come to-night for to bring you t'roo."

Lak de young Jesu w'en he's here below
 De face of ma leetle son look jus' so—
 Den off beyon', on de bush I see
 De w'ite dress fadin' among de tree—
 Was it a dream I dream las' night
 Is goin' away on de morning light?

I see that the time is about up, for I purposed addressing you for only half an hour. I just want to say in conclusion, as one looking on and watching your progress, that I am always interested in the literary work of Canada. I realize that you have great literary possibilities here. You have great possibilities, east and west, and far to the north, farther north even than Dr. Cook went. (Laughter.) The future of Canadian literature is indeed full of promise. For while the literary firmament of other lands is darkened with the twilight of eve, the literary firmament of Canada is rosy with the promise of dawn. Not yet has come our Canadian Longfellow, our Canadian Tennyson, or our Canadian Browning. When he does come, he shall come dowered with the fullest gift of song, and shall catch up in that song something of the sublimity of our mountains, the light and glow of our northern stars, something of the sweep and dash of our mighty rivers, the music and murmur of our blossoming prairies, the honest manhood of our marts and farms, the strong virtues of our homes and firesides, the tenderness of our mothers' prayers, the sweetness and purity of our maidens' hearts! (Applause.)

(March 22nd, 1913.)

The Borden Naval Policy.

BY MR. ARTHUR MEIGHEN, M.P.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club on March 22, 1913, Mr. Meighen said:

My duty just now is to say something worthy the attendance of busy men on behalf of the Naval Policy of the present Government. Rising directly in front of me I see two conspicuous and threatening difficulties; first, to compress into half an hour any useful restatement or compendium of a case so thoroughly elucidated during four years by the Press of Canada, and second, to present a party view—in which I enthusiastically share—a party view of a party question without too vigorously invading party politics. To surmounting these difficulties I now without further introduction address myself, and if I do not get over the last hurdle very gracefully, I invite you all to try the same acrobatic performance, and then to criticise my attempt this afternoon.

The main proposal of the Government is to add without delay to the fighting power of Britain's Navy, three of the strongest ships of war known to Naval science, built with the money of Canada but placed unreservedly under Admiralty control—subject only to recall on sufficient notice. There are other important but subsidiary proposals, such as the mutual encouragement by the Governments of Britain and Canada extended to Canadians to man these vessels, the commencement on a practical basis and the prosecution on an expanding scale of ship-building of all kinds in this country, Britain even sharing in the extra cost. Meantime the organization of a permanent Naval Policy stands for mature consideration and development and for submission to the votes of Canadian electors.

What I have sketched as subsidiary proposals for the moment are really of great and lasting consequence but sedulously overlooked by our party opponents. And I, too, am compelled to-day to centre my remarks around the first—the commanding element of our policy.

* Mr. Arthur Meighen represents Portage la Prairie in the House of Commons in the Conservative interest. He is a logical and forceful speaker and likely ere long to enter the Borden cabinet.

Permit me in very moderate language to refer to some objections to this proposal offered before your Club a few days ago by Hon. Mackenzie King. Mr. King took exception first on constitutional grounds, claiming that our constitutional foundations in the British North America Act are not wide enough to enable us to place Canadian-owned vessels under Imperial control for Empire defence. "The British North America Act," he said, "never contemplated going outside of Canada and affecting the Naval Power and authority of Britain." This at least has the merit of novelty. Well, as Mr. King says, we have the power to legislate for the peace, order and good Government of Canada in matters—among others—of Naval defence. And if we have the power to provide for our Naval defence surely there is an implied power to decide in what way we may best so provide. Acting within the compass of that authority we now elect that the best way is to add to the Imperial Navy, our present defence. Later on Mr. King says:—"Our Pacific fleet could go to the rescue of Australia or to assist in the China seas." Now it must be under Admiralty control before it can strike. So Mr. King's position is that our vessels may cruise the Antipodes and the China seas, but the moment they enter waters that wash Britain's shores there is an end of the constitution.

Then again—this Government, he says, is bound by the joint resolution of March, 1909, no matter what is best for the Empire. I answer: That resolution in its latter clause provided clearly that whenever need arose we owed it to Britain to spring to her side with all the resources of Canada. If then such need exists we can take this step under the direct mandate thus propounded. That it does exist I will presently show. For the present I add only this, that the first part of that resolution specifying the character of the Naval Service Canada should organize, specifying that it must be consistent with the highest advice of the Admiralty in 1907, in co-operation with the Admiralty always, and that its single purpose must be the supremacy of the Imperial Fleet; that resolution with those clauses we say clearly banned and forbade the programme of the late Government, and those clauses applied to-day just as clearly negative the proposals of the same party now.

Lastly, Mr. King advances an ethical argument. He says to own three of the most powerful instruments of destruction in the world is not good national morals. I always understood that battleships were made to fight and to destroy—to

prolong peace by being able to fight and to destroy. To build battleships is either wrong or right; under present world conditions I conceive it to be right, but how can it be good morals to build a ten thousand ton vessel, and bad morals to build a twenty thousand? It is bad ethics, we are told, to build large warships that will contribute to victory but good ethics to build smaller craft that are fore-doomed to defeat.

So much for objections. I now come to the positive side of the argument. The Borden proposal to provide at once a number of master battleships for the Imperial Admiralty is the quickest, most direct and effective way to aid the Motherland. That affirmation I do not propose to argue. It is an axiom that no serious man disputes. The Admiralty had been telling us so plainly for twelve years and never more forcibly than in December, 1912. Ah! but we are told, though that be true, the Motherland is not in danger to-day—there is no need, “no emergency,” as they like to praise it. “Britain is not on her knees. Her fleet is still the strongest by a fair margin, so we don’t need to assist her in the quickest, most direct and effective way. We can afford to start where Britain started centuries ago, where the United States started may decades ago, and wait for the evolution of a fleet built here before lending a hand to Britain.” My duty is to show you that such an attitude, such a delay, are unthinkable to the Canadian Nation.

In the first place, the Parent Country has for 150 years borne the burden of the defence of our shores, and of our commerce without aid from us. The share of her expenditure attributable to her responsibility for this country is hard to apportion but is undoubtedly enormous, perhaps \$400,000,000. She bears that burden to-day protecting a sea commerce of Canada of over \$400,000,000 annually. Does an Imperial obligation then not now exist? “But,” we are told, “Britain would have had to maintain her sea supremacy anyway for her own protection as an island kingdom, and for the safety of her trade.” Suppose that is true, how can it affect the argument? We have got the benefit, we are part of the Empire whose parent branch has borne this tremendous strain. We are strong now, growing proudly into full partnership. We look at Argentina with \$200,000,000 spent that Britain has enabled us to save for home development. We look at every other independent maritime state and read the same lesson. We have had the benefit. We are part of the Empire, and have obligations as such. We are able to make

practical acknowledgment. I put it before you—should we not do so now—directly and effectively now?

But other and tremendous facts make our duty clearer still, and show the advantage to Canada of doing this thing for duty is always golden in the end. Within the past fifteen years the great nations of Europe and of Asia have added to their armaments by sea and land at a pace unknown in history, until to-day half of this world, the advance guard of civilization is in very truth an armed camp. Conspicuous among these there is one great people, out-numbering the total white subjects of George V. scattered over seven seas, and increasing more rapidly than Britain, France, Austria, and Italy added together,—one great people I say, great in arms, on land the strongest on the globe, supreme in military Europe, impregnable against attack by land or sea,—a great people, great in wealth, in commerce and science the marvel of the age, fertile and resourceful of intellect, resolute and indomitable of will, virile of character and historically fond of war,—that people an ascendant people with hope always burning and organized for results as never a nation was organized, that people within those years has entered the lists as a naval power, and is already second in the world. Their present law provides, even granting that it will stand without amendment for seven years, for one thousand per cent. greater instantaneous fighting powers than it had as recently as 1898. By 1915, says the Admiralty memorandum,

“Great Britain will have 25 Dreadnought battleships, and two Nelsons, and Germany 17.

Great Britain will have six battle cruisers and Germany six.”

A margin of safety “which,” the memorandum says, “does not err on the side of excess, and will steadily diminish as Britain’s older predreadnought vessels grow obsolete and new vessels become larger.”

By the same year, says this official document, Britain’s strength in capital ships will be surpassed by the other powers of Europe as 35 to 51.

The astounding growth of the German navy has been accompanied until lately by significant official statements and an astonishing National enthusiasm, for National enthusiasm will always respond when National interests are involved. The Emperor himself, in whose great ability and peaceful ambitious Sir Wilfrid Laurier expresses reliance, has not hesitated, until very lately at least, to voice his country’s purpose. I admit his supreme authority and capacity. He is

perhaps the most forceful personality on earth. But in 1901 he said, "as my grandfather reorganized the army, so I shall reorganize my navy without flinching, and in the same way until it stands on the same level as my army so that with its help Germany may reach the position which it has not yet secured."

In 1899 he coined the winged phrase,

"Our future lies upon the water."

Around this spirited rhapsody some three-score songs have clustered, and they are sung daily by the children of the fatherland. And again,

"Without the consent of Germany's ruler nothing must happen in any part of the world."

Then as lately as 1907, on election night, he said from his Palace window,

"I thank you for your ovation. To-day you have proven the word of the Imperial Chancellor. Germany can ride if she cares to. If men of all ranks and faiths stand together we can ride down all those who block our path."

And this is attributed to Prince Bülow, Chancellor at the time, and appeared in a semi-official organ,

"The movement of Naval expansion in Germany will not end until a German Navy floats on the sea that can compete with the Navy of Great Britain. Equally strong on sea and on land the world may choose our friendship or our enmity."

"The old century," says another temperate and typical journal, "saw a German Europe. The new century shall see a German world. To attain this consummation two duties are required of the present German generation—to keep its own counsel, and to create a strong naval force."

Kaiser William II is a master of many activities, but essentially a soldier and possessed with that supreme belief in himself that has distinguished the greatest of men, that inspired Cromwell and Alexander and Bonaparte, and now as he turns the vessel of his country toward the troubled seas of a World Empire he never doubts that she will survive the storm because, in his belief she carries the Julius Caesar of this century.

Not for over three hundred years has supremacy on land and sea been united in the same power, not since the days of Phillip of Spain. Should such a thing result at this time and under modern conditions, either by success in the race of armaments or in the clash of war, it would be serious for the world—but for us as an Empire it would be the setting of the sun. I repeat, whether without war by preponderance in

armaments, or with war by victory in battle, the verdict may be differently phrased, but the stern sentence is the same. On this subject listen to Churchill, speaking the words of Premier Asquith, of Mr. Lloyd George, and Sir Edward Grey, of the whole Liberal Government weighted with an Empire's care,—

"Between us and other nations—there is no parity of risk; our position is highly artificial. We are fed from the sea. We are an unarmed people. We are the only Power in Europe that does not possess a large army. We do not wish to menace the vital interest of any continental state, and if we did wish to we have not the power. When we consider our naval strength we are thinking not of our Commerce but of our freedom, not of our trade but of our lives."

And again,

"If any single nation were able to back the strongest fleet with an overwhelming army the whole world would be in jeopardy, and a catastrophe would swiftly occur."

Now listen to Mr. Balfour who knows also what these things mean. In June, 1912,

"There are two ways in which a hostile country can be crushed. It can be conquered, or it can be starved. If Germany were master in our home waters she could apply both methods to Britain. Were Britain ten times master of the North Sea she could apply neither method to Germany. Without a superior fleet Great Britain would no longer count as a power. Without any fleet at all Germany would remain the greatest power in Europe."

We may gloss the subject as we like and take diplomatic assurances unaccompanied by facts of policy, but that nation has succeeded best that accepted diplomatic assurances only in the light of facts and policy. And a country that seized Schleswig-Holstein without warning, and Silesia without warning, that turned suddenly and humbled Austria in '66, and then in 1870, just a few weeks after a French Ministry had assured its people that the outlook for peace never was brighter—invaded that Republic and erected the German Empire on the ruins of France, that country, I say, cannot complain if we govern our conduct with due regard to history and conceded facts of the present day.

What then is my conclusion? It is this,—that as regards the Motherland these are no ordinary times. They are even now and until the tide turns, the pace slackens, extraordinary, and momentarily so. England is still, we believe, supreme on water, and she is determined so to remain. Does that

affect the argument? Does that affect our duty to her or to ourselves? Are we to wait till her hands are up before coming to her side? Are we to wait till war-clouds appear before commencing to build Dreadnoughts that take two and three years to complete? Is there not a call to Canada for immediate, direct and effective aid? If not now, how could there ever be when that aid in naval war could mean anything at all?

We may hold back if we will, and take comfort in vague principles of cosmopolitan benevolence, but if we do and others of our kin, equally entitled, do the same, we may prepare as a great state to close the books, smooth the path of liquidation, and sing the even song of Empire.

"But," we are told, "Australia is having built a fleet unit." Well, Canada should be more than a copyist. But Australia has done already what we purpose doing now, and the resources of that Dominion now add to the strength of the line of steel that guards the heart of this Empire. Situated as this country is we may fear no attack by sea except on the Pacific by the defeat of the British squadron in the China seas, or on either coast by the collapse of our battle line in the North Sea. We are not a small independent nation like Argentina, guarding against attack by similar states and trusting only to a jealous maintenance of the balance of power for protection against the strong. We are part of Greater Britain, and must order our affairs of defence in the light of that supreme unalterable fact. We fall only when Britain falls. Our present policy centres on that truth. Our permanent policy must follow the same pole star. Should other counsels than Mr. Borden's now prevail, then, I ask you to answer—which is the more likely to triumph,—an august Empire, proud of her centuries of success and prone to reflect on her past, long accustomed to unchallenged supremacy at sea, but disseminating her strength under widely scattered controls, each withdrawable and perhaps unavailable in war, or a great ascendant nation, nerved by ambition and organized for defined results, its thousand giant energies all concentrated on a well studied purpose, and "moving imperturbably to its goal across the whole lifetime of a generation?"

"Ah," but we are asked, "what about our autonomy?" We have autonomy long established, dominion autonomy, provincial autonomy, even municipal autonomy, each supreme within its orbit. But the defence of this Empire by sea is not a provincial, not a dominion, concern. It is preeminently an Im-

perial concern, and it is no more a breach of our autonomy to add of our own free will to a united navy than was it straining Britain's autonomy to erect for all the bulwarks of a common defence. No, it is the highest exercise of the autonomy of both. It is autonomy to autonomy engaged.

Gentlemen, that is our policy. (Applause.)

(March 25th, 1913.)

The Test of a True Democracy.

BY VEN. ARCHDEACON H. J. CODY, D.D., LL.D.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 25th March, Archdeacon Cody said:

Mr. Chairman, and fellow members of the Canadian Club.—You almost overwhelm me by the cordiality of your welcome, and by your muster in such numbers, but "How can man die better than facing fearful odds?" (Laughter.)

I do not to-day speak as an expert on the subject of democracy. Sir William Robertson Nicoll, in a recent number of *The British Weekly*, says that the expert to-day is "going about naked and unashamed, pouring out his dogmatic wisdom, so that people are experiencing an inevitable reaction even against his wise counsels." This may be an irrational reaction, but it is real and must be taken into account. I do not, then, speak as an expert, but only as a member of the Club speaking to other members of the Club. I wish to deal with a problem old, yet ever new, and ever confronting us, in the hope that by the effort to analyze it we may gain a clue to its solution.

The principle of democracy may be summed up in three propositions: (1) The first proposition is that the things common to all men are more important than the things that are peculiar to any man. (2) The second proposition is that all men are our own flesh and blood. You remember Mr. Gladstone made that appeal, on one occasion, when seeking to obtain an extension of the franchise to workingmen, "After all, they are our own flesh and blood!" That is the central principle of democracy. (3) The third proposition is that the most vitally important things have at last to be left to the ordinary man himself,—such things, for example, as the choice of rulers. These three propositions are implied in the principle of democracy.

But what will be our test of true democracy? What standard shall we apply to an individual, a nation, or a civilization,

* The Venerable Archdeacon Henry John Cody, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Toronto, was born at Embro, Ontario, in 1868. He was a member of the Commission that reorganized the University of Toronto. In 1904 he was elected Bishop of Nova Scotia but declined the honor.

if we wish to determine whether that individual or nation or civilization has really progressed? The test I desire to apply is simply this: reverence for personality. In order to be able to apply that test, let us go back and contrast the ancient city State of Greece or Rome with our modern State. We shall see the characteristics of that city State, and, by contrast, what has produced the change to the modern State.

The ancient city state was marked by the principle of *exclusive citizenship*. All the citizens of that State were descended from a common ancestor, who in course of time became a deity. They were thus connected by a common origin. This bond in its turn was based upon a religious tie. All those within the magic circle of the city were bound together; there was an organic unity. All those outside the city were under no obligation to the citizens, and the citizens felt no obligation toward them. The ancient civilization was essentially a communal type, as against the present individualistic type; the present life was self-sufficing, in contrast to the haunting sense of infinity which pervades the modern world.

The *domination of the individual by the State* was another characteristic of the ancient city. The citizenship was exclusive, and the individual was altogether dominated by the State. Individual freedom counted for nothing as against the State. The whole range of the citizen's interests and activities was more or less covered by the State. There was no reverence for the person as such. All the actual States of antiquity were founded on slavery. More than that, gentlemen, even the ideal States of Plato and Aristotle assumed slavery as a fundamental institution. The citizens could not develop themselves unless there was this substratum of slavery. Religion had reference merely to temporal blessings and the present life; the rule of law was not separated from the rule of religion.

When we contrast this ancient State with the modern State, we find a growing "dynamic" as opposed to a "static" conception of truth. There is more tolerance. There is freedom of investigation, based upon freedom of conscience, which has led to what we call the scientific age. We are conscious of a great step, a step which we believe is a step forward. What has made the change?

As a matter of historical fact, the change has been brought about by the advent of Christianity. This is not a matter merely of religious conviction, but of historical fact. Here you have the ancient State, its strength consisting in the organic unity of a comparatively small body; Christianity

comes, and extending the principle of unity to its logical conclusion, takes the sweep of the whole world, and sees all men to be an organic unity, because all are linked with the great Creator and Saviour of mankind. That is to say, the brotherhood of man is based by religious conviction upon the fatherhood of God. It has developed and extended the narrow organic unity of the ancient State.

The defects of the ancient State were surely the exclusiveness of its citizenship and the absolute dominance of the individual by the State. Christianity widens the citizenship and gives it a cosmopolitan character. It redeems, develops and consecrates the individual. It lays fundamental emphasis upon personality, it reverences and respects personality, and gives to personality a religious basis. The priceless value and sacredness of the individual is the greatest contrast between the ancient and the modern State, and marks the lengths we have come.

The modern State preserves what is best in the ancient, and supplements and corrects it. The modern State consecrates personality; combines co-operation with individual freedom and initiative, the sense of organic unity with the sense of a contribution which each citizen can make to the State as a whole, independence with the sense of fellowship. It takes up all that is best in the ancient State on the line of co-operation, and supplements it. And it adds the new element of reverence for personality.

Therefore neither "atomistic individualism, nor swamping socialism,"—I quote the words—"nor ancient communalism" can dominate the future. There will never be effective co-operation unless each individual in the State is able to make his own contribution. All must co-operate. No unimportant antagonisms must prevent each from giving of his best. To-day in the course of progress we may need to lay emphasis again upon this factor of co-operation for the very sake of keeping individual freedom, preserving individual initiative, and ensuring that the individual can make his best contribution to the whole. We have always to distinguish between that form of co-operation which smothers individual initiative, and those other forms which are necessary to ensure to the individual his self-expression and his full opportunity of service.

Now, gentlemen, as we have in a brief and somewhat abstract form contrasted the ancient State, and its exaggerated idea of co-operation, with the modern State, we are able to see what is the test of civilization, the true test of democracy.

the true standard of a nation's progress. It is *reverence for personality*. That has been, as a matter of fact, the determining principle of human advance; it will be a guide for us in the multiplex problems of the present day.

This is not a mere academic discussion because the contrast between the Orient and the Occident to-day is very much the contrast between the ancient and the modern world. Practically the ancient ideals and politics are represented to-day in that civilization of the Orient with which we are coming into close contact; and this civilization is taking on some features of our own civilization. Are they taking on the truest and best features of our civilization, namely, those that are created by reverence for personality?

This reverence for personality is a fundamental moral principle. Many of you will follow me back to the days when you sat at the feet of that great prophet, Professor George Paxton Young, in the University of Toronto, and heard him quote Kant's golden phrase on the practical imperative: "Always so act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as a means only." And we remember Hegel's words: "Be a person and respect the personality of others." Lotze, in his "Microcosmos," expresses the belief "that this sense of reverence for personality has been unconsciously the guiding principle in all the moral development of the race."

Not only is this belief the essential and inestimable worth of man a fundamental moral principle but a basic Christian assumption. Not long since, Professor Harnack said: "Jesus Christ was the first to bring the value of every human soul to light, and what He did no one can any more undo." To fail, then, in reverencing and respecting personality is to fail at the very centre of what should be modern civilization.

This principle involves *respect for ourselves*. To break down self-respect is to put a barrier in the way of the progress of every man, woman, child, or nation. Without self-control, no worthy achievement is possible. Without belief in our own unique, indispensable place and function in life, we shall never gird ourselves for high tasks. Without respect for ourselves, we shall have contempt for others, and no basis for our own character. Ultimately a man's sole gift either to God or to man is the gift of himself, and what contribution can we make if we do not value personality in ourselves and others? "We can never expect character or influence or happiness in man or in the race without fundamental respect for self." No man can keep a genuine self-respect if he seeks to degrade

another. Booker Washington expresses the thought in this way: "We have come to know that one man cannot hold another man down in the ditch without remaining in the ditch with him." (Applause.)

Not only must there be a genuine self-respect, but there must be genuine respect for the convictions of others, in matters political, and in matters religious. Fichte says: "He becomes a slave who treats another as a slave." The greatest peril in the use of personal power is the peril to the tyrant's own character. Character deteriorates steadily whenever the attitude of simple tyranny is adopted. Wherever you have "the bossing spirit of contempt"—whether in the church, or in politics, or in society, you have the corrosion and degradation of character. It is impossible to exert a deep influence upon others, to make them good and useful men and women, without respect for their liberty. For this means the calling out of their own will, their own thought, their own consciousness.

Reverence for personality involves not only self-respect, and respect for the liberty of others, but respect for the inner worth, and personality of others. That is why no cynic can ever be a good man, or a good leader, or a truly happy human being. People who are always sitting by and despising life, afraid of being "done," as they say, in the struggle of life, are the men who at the end have got the least out of life. (Applause.)

If this test of progress is admitted in regard to individuals and personal relations, is it not applicable to the relations between nations? Gentlemen, it has often been pointed out that the moral progress of the race, as a whole, is due to the belief, and to action on the belief, that moral obligations which hold for individuals ought to hold for groups of individuals, for business houses, for corporations, for classes, for municipalities, for nations, and for nations in their international relations. No more serious problem confronts us whether as individuals or as nations or as members of a world State, than this problem,—how far are we reverencing personality?

We shall find that this respect for personality may flourish in strange places, under politics not called democratic, and may be signally lacking under politics in which men shout themselves hoarse in glorifying democracy. Not all that calls itself democracy is democracy. This principle does not mean letting everyone do as he pleases, and heeding all individual whims. In very love and reverence for personality, restraint may be necessary, and guidance must be given.

Canada is going to do her work as a democracy. How true is her democracy? There is no power in the mere name. You may remember how it is said that George Whitefield could pronounce the word "Mesopotamia" in such accents that he almost broke the hearts of pious women not a few, who heard him, and remarked that "that blessed word, Mesopotamia was so comforting." (Laughter.) Now the blessed word, "democracy," is very comforting to some people in its very utterance. But what is true democracy? It is that which respects personality, develops personality, and educes the highest personality from all citizens. The democratic tendency is here to stay: we cannot turn it back. As we go forward, there is a call to a truer, higher, nobler democracy, that is, to one which shall be absolutely loyal to this basic Christian conviction of the priceless value and sacredness of every individual person, and therefore will allow no person to be a mere tool or instrument or convenience to another. A true democracy is one that is permeated with the spirit of reverence for each personality.

A democracy cannot make enduring progress without taking moral progress. Its foundations have to be laid in justice for all, and in ceaseless endeavour to bring all to the height of their several capacities. Therefore it is that the future of the Canadian people lies in the future of the Canadian conscience. (Applause.) No progress will be made by any democracy that is not through and throughout moral progress.

Does true democracy mean putting all persons on the dead level of the ancient communism? No! Does it mean the insistence that all men have equal capacities for service, and therefore must be equally rewarded? No! But it means this: "the possibility of a man's life for every man!" (Applause.): —the possibility of each man coming to his own best, and being encouraged by the whole community in attaining his own best. This involves exceptional reward for exceptional service, though this reward may often take the form of wider opportunity for unselfish leadership.

In the future of our own Dominion there will be an increasing number of men who will devote consummate ability not to piling up personal fortunes but to rendering public service. (Applause.)

You may apply this principle of reverence for personality to our economic conditions. In the conquest of natural resources the whole community has certain inalienable rights to conserve. Have we conserved them? Are we pursuing a democratic policy in the use of our natural resources, or is

there too great a monopoly by private persons? Can we combine individual initiative and the development of latent capacity with the fair sharing by the community, as a whole, in all the gains made? Are we truly democratic in our policy of controlling public utilities? Are we so in regard to the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the few? "Unearned special privileges cannot prove ultimately either an honour or a blessing." Reward should be according to service.

Apply this test in the realm of the social. The great problem is just this: are we going to make the rights of property more valuable than the rights of persons? (Hear, hear.) One reason, perhaps, why in every new community there is a tendency to exaggerate the rights of property, is that we ourselves, or our forefathers, came across the sea largely to better our material conditions; there is therefore a tendency to exaggerate things material. But the great issue is this: are persons greater than things, or are things greater than persons? The real wealth of nations consists of persons; therefore we need to have a more constructive national policy for the better welfare, the normal growth, the wiser and more complete education of persons.

Apply this principle of respect for personality in the realm of education. Is an absolutely uniform method of teaching consistent with reverence for personality? Are we going to get the best results from our educational system, unless there is possible in it some measure of elasticity such as will provide for the peculiarities of the individual? One of the greatest temptations to which we are all exposed is that we should succumb to what one has called the "passion for material comfort above all things." Are persons to be so absorbed in things that personality is no longer to be revered?

Some time since, James Russell Lowell, at the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Harvard, uttered these words, as applicable to Canada in this stage of her growth as to the United States of America:

"A man rich only for himself has a life as barren and cheerless as that of the serpent set to guard a hidden treasure. I am saddened when I see our successes as a nation measured by the number of acres under tillage or of bushels of wheat exported: for the real value of a country must be weighed in scales more delicate than the balance of trade. The garner of Sicily are empty now, but the bees from all climes still fetch honey from the tiny garden plot of Theocritus. On a map of the world you may cover Judæa with your thumb,

Athens with a finger tip, and neither of them figures in the Prices Current; but they still lord it in the thought and action of every civilized man. Material success is good, but only as the necessary preliminary of better things. *The measure of a nation's success is the amount it has contributed to the thought, the moral energy, the intellectual happiness, the spiritual hope and consolation of mankind.*" (Applause.)

Note.—I would warmly commend to any who are interested in this subject a highly suggestive and stimulating book by President H. C. King, of Oberlin, entitled "The Moral and Religious Challenge of our Times." I am deeply indebted to it.—H.J.C.

(March 31st, 1913.)

The Academic Mind in Politics.

BY DR. MAURICE HUTTON.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 31st March, Principal Hutton said:—

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—The extraordinarily flattering terms of this postcard, "He has gained continental reputation as an after dinner speaker," reminds me of a friend of mine, a professor, who dined out at a considerable distance from the place where he was staying, and as the roads were bad he thought it necessary to take a lantern. The dinner was very good, the company very convivial, but all he knew was that he returned safe and, as he thought, with his lantern; the day after his return he was somewhat astonished to receive a telegram from his friend, saying: "Your lantern safe and burning brightly, kindly return at your convenience parrot and cage!" (Laughter.) Now, gentlemen, I hope the lantern of my reputation is burning brightly somewhere on the continent, though I have not the ghost of an idea where I left it; but I must try to discharge the obligation in connection with the parrot and cage: I mean I am to become the channel, the funnel, or the parrot for the thoughts which I catch around me from Professor Milner, and Dr. Wallace, and my other colleagues, and which I also pick up in books; and if some of them come from my own mind, still nobody knows whether these parrots, which sometimes speak so appositely, may not be fetching these thoughts sometimes from some obscure intelligence in their own brains, and whether they may not sometimes be giving their own opinions. (Laughter.)

When my friend, Dr. Colquhoun, did me the honor to suggest that I should address the Club, we happened to be considering together the work of the society called "The League of the Empire," the society started in London by Mrs. Ord Marshall, which has for its object the binding of the Empire together, through the schools and the school teachers: it is an essentially sober and simple society, which works chiefly in two ways: it endeavours to link together schools, which nature and geography have separated, by en-

* Dr. Maurice Hutton is Principal of University College, Toronto.

couraging the children of one school in one part of the Empire to correspond with the children of another school in another part, school children in Canada with those in England, and so on: the children will write of the conditions of life in their own school neighbourhood, of the things they are taught, of the games they play, the chief interests of the life around them, the books they read, the sights they see, the animals and flowers familiar to them, the life they look forward to, their holidays and the circuses which they enjoy, or the seaside visits which at least the poor things try to enjoy.

Obviously nothing, on one assumption, could do more to familiarize the coming citizens of this many-colored Empire with the nature of the life in other portions: nothing, on one assumption, could do more to make the many colors of the Empire stand out vividly to the eyes of those, who see only one color perhaps immediately around them: the assumption, that is, that the children can write letters, are to some extent born letter writers, able to dismiss the trivialities with which their elders fill *their* letters, able to invest even the weather, which is so trivial in our letters, with that local color which may make it significant and interesting to children in another latitude and longitude, habituated to a different climate, accustomed to see played before them on a different stage and with different scenery the eternal yet moving drama of the seasons. This is a rather large assumption, perhaps: that the children will write out of the fulness of their hearts, and not out of the vacuity of their minds, will have the gift to read their own hearts aright, and will have yet the greater gift to put into simple words the interesting things they find there. But after all, being children, and not men and women of the world, it is at least conceivable that the children will write out of their hearts better than we do, will write more than we do what interests them, and therefore will interest their correspondents better than their parents do.

There is a second object which the League of the Empire seeks: it collects the teachers of the Empire at various centres of the Empire from time to time, and shows them the things worth seeing around those centres: the teachers of Canada and of the other overseas Dominions were in London last year, and were taken to see not merely the wealth of historic places in London of general interest, and not merely the places of special interest to school teachers, like the original school-room of Harrow with the original forms and desks, but also to Oxford and other cities accessible to London.

This possibly is an even more fruitful style of Empire building than the linking of schools by inter-Empire correspondence. No one who has crossed the ocean of recent years with hosts of intelligent teachers from the United States can doubt how blessed a work of racial peace and goodwill, of Anglo-Saxon reconciliation, has sprung from the travels of American teachers; from their seeing with their own eyes the places they have heard of, the household names which belong to that literature of Shakespeare and Milton, which is theirs as well as ours, the cities and villages from which their own ancestors came. If the history books of the United States' schools are no longer of the violent anti-British character which once marked them, the credit does not wholly belong to the upright, conscientious and truth-loving spirit of the rising generation of American historians,—though some of it belongs to them,—nor to the labors of Mr. Morse Stephens and a few other British historians on this side, who have made it their mission to combat political prejudices and revive racial sympathies—a work in which I think Mr. J. A. Macdonald, of *The Globe*, has also contributed forcefully, and for which we are indebted to him,—but it is partly due to the increase of travel in summer, among teachers, to the mother country.

It may even be that this is as great as any more purely intellectual and more purely educational advantage which travel affords. Travel is supposed of course to broaden the intellect and equip the mind; but the results in this direction are often meagre enough, except for those with a quick eye and a natural gift for observation; for others, even for cultivated people, it is often vanity and vexation of spirit: to wander from picture gallery to picture gallery—unless one understands painting—is often only a pilgrimage of pain, especially pain in the back of the neck and head, pain which is occasionally but only partially relieved by flippant bets upon the number of arrows one is going to find in the next martyrdom of that animated pincushion—as some American called him—St. Sebastian. (Laughter.) Such useless sort of travel enhances one's sense of the wisdom not of foreign travel, but of the American philosopher Thoreau, who wrote, "I have traveled widely in Concord, in my library." But real travel—not for travel's sake—but to see the places one has learned to love, to understand the authors one has learned to enjoy, the school teachers' travels to Great Britain, these travels are on a far higher plane, and bear far richer fruits, than the idle procession of the idle rich in speeding autos

from one gluttonous continental hotel to another. It is difficult for a speeding auto to educate anyone, even though Noah, Daniel and Job were in it! (Laughter.) And if this travel be fruitful of good in the case of school teachers from the United States, how much more in the case of school teachers from Canada!

However, I do not propose to speak only of the League of the Empire, nor of its intention to gather the teachers of the Empire here in Toronto in 1915, or in 1916, it may be; the intention which interests Dr. Colquhoun especially and me, and I think may be of interest to other members of this Club. Rather I call your attention to this beneficent work of academic politics, of academic Empire-building, to serve as a sort of defence, it may be, or a set-off, against other tendencies of the academic mind in politics, much more ambitious and exciting, but much more dubious in wisdom and debatable in value: even though lending themselves more readily to literary treatment and to the entertainment of a general audience.

"Must college professors and schoolmasters always be visionary and impractical?" said some New York newspaper the other day, in reference to President Wilson's inaugural; I suppose the editor meant: must their speeches always be full of hot air, and pious opinions, and counsels of perfection, and of the ideals of the millenium?

That is certainly one aspect of the academic mind in politics: the academic politician likes vague generalities and general principles more than tiresome detail or expediency or compromise; he wants to apply general principles to everything offhand at once; three such principles in particular, I think I have observed, are ever in his mouth and mind.

The academic mind is living in the Republic of Letters; the Republic of Letters has neither flag nor country; and yet it is none the worse on that account: the academic world of thought is obviously the service of humanity, not of one nation; its triumphs pass at once into all countries and into all languages: its work is the work of the impersonal human reason. But there is no contradiction between such academic work for humanity and a patriot's service of his own country: ninety-nine per cent. of such workers are doing such work directly for their own countrymen, though the work itself has no narrow national significance; though the science taught, I mean, is not British science but universal, though the mathematics are not French—except in the sense that

they have been inspired by French genius—but universal. The teacher of German, again, is teaching German as a language of universal interest and not as an agent of the Triple Alliance,—though he is sure to sympathize with the German people. Even the teacher of Greek is not there to boom the Greek claim to Janina and Monastir, while he will of course sympathize with that claim,—but to explain certain monuments and landmarks in the history of universal literature. There is no contradiction, therefore, in the Republic of Letters between the service of humanity and the service of the country to which the teacher belongs, and there is nothing to prevent the great man of science from being also like Pasteur, for example, a passionately patriotic Frenchman. But there is a natural tendency, nevertheless, in the Republic of Letters to overlook national differences, to make light of patriotism, to exalt in its place those very general terms known as Cosmopolitanism, Humanitarianism, and, in these last days, Pacifism. These are high words, and suggest thought in high altitudes: some mist, perhaps, therefore, and a little fog, perhaps, and cloud, and not unfrequently much wind. (Laughter.)

The Republican of Letters, dwelling on these mountain peaks apart, and far away from his nearest neighbors, can hardly be a violent nationalist, still less a chauvinist or a jingo. I never personally, by the way, so far as I know, met a jingo intimately: neither among my academic colleagues, of course, nor even among my other friends. I had always supposed that Jingoism was the momentary creation of the superheated atmosphere of London music halls, a creature of the hour and of an hour, a gaseous exhalation given off in the mood of after-dinner relaxation; and even then and there, even in the music halls, the jingo, if I recollect his origin, was a person, to judge from his own words, not unlike the Editor of the *Toronto Globe*: "he did not want to fight," he said, and yet he seemed to breathe an air of fighting. (Laughter.) Of course he added that "he had the ships,"—wherein perhaps my analogy,—fails—the Editor hasn't any ships, and heaven knows when Canada will have them if we wait for the Editor to fix the date! (Laughter.) I repeat that I never met any jingoes intimately, but I see so many rebukes directed towards them in the daily paper which I read daily and conscientiously, that I almost begin to suppose that they may exist somewhere somehow, and are not wholly a bogey word, a figment of the editorial imagination, so fruitful in figments and in pigments. (Laughter.)

However, to return to our Republican of Letters—he leans naturally away from Jingoism and Nationalism and in the direction of Cosmopolitanism, Humanitarianism, and Pacifism: and leaning naturally thereto, it is equally natural that he should sometimes lose his balance, and fall entirely on the Pacifist side of that fence upon which as an impartial and scientific student he is supposed to be sitting. He is obsessed, even, it may be with a horror of war: he can see nothing noble, nothing even lawful in it; no occasion that can justify it: he makes war on war!

Great and good men have felt this obsession against war. It was the moving passion of that great and good man, who added distinction to Toronto, Mr. Goldwin Smith: it explained and justified, to his mind at least, those portions of his political program with which the rest of the community, and even the lesser members of the great Republic of Letters, were out of sympathy; it was on this account that at a time when indiscriminating patriotism was more natural to us all than discriminating epithets, he was even dubbed a “pro-Boer.” Other pro-Boers there have been in the Empire, equally distinguished some of them, and equally conscientious; every variety of human nature, in fact, has been covered by that opprobrious epithet, from the single-minded Quaker-like disciple of peace to the mere cantankerous and boorish humbug, who sided with the enemy not because he loved the enemy more but because he loved his own countrymen less:—he who loves not his own countrymen whom he has seen, how shall he love the other countrymen whom he has not seen? (Laughter.)

These pacifists and humanitarians and cosmopolitans of the Republic of Letters are especially conspicuous, as one would expect, in France, the land of logic and ideas and ideals. When I was in France the public school teachers were banded together in some places into leagues to resist war, to protest against the army, to denounce patriotism: leagues of anti-patriots and anti-militarists; but it was not an ungenerous or selfish league, it was not a part of that ungenerous and selfish force called class-consciousness, which is the curse of politics; it arose naturally, if regrettably, from tendencies inevitable in the Republic of Letters. That is the first general tendency that I note in the academic mind, to cosmopolitanism, to humanitarianism, to pacifism.

Let me take another illustration of academic politics, equally the outcome of this same principle, of this love of general ideas, of broad and vague idealism, rather than of

practical details and commonplace convenience and compromise. I think the feminism of this age, the feeling that the suffrage should now be extended to women, is traceable in some measure to the academic mind. It all began of course with Plato, and was revived last century by John Stuart Mill. Now it certainly did not begin with Plato in sentiment, though John Stuart Mill revived it sentimentally: it began in logic and in the love of logic: on what principle can you withhold the vote? You cannot deny that among the lower animals difference of sex never constitutes difference of function; you cannot deny, either, the intellect and intelligence of women—every school prize-day, every University class-list, shows them to be at least our equals; then there is nothing more to be said: given equality of vote to those who have shown themselves (to say the least) our equals in intelligence: and even—if I may take a further dive into the future, and develop Plato for a moment—even if female suffrage leads to female members of Parliament and female premiers, well, gentlemen, looking at Ottawa to-day, I may ask you, why not? (Laughter.) How should there be anything in principle to keep women out of the House of Commons at Ottawa at the present moment? To sit round in a sort of sewing circle week-in and week-out, and nag at each other day and night, is there anything in that beyond the capacity of women? (Laughter.) It seems to me rather a feminine ambition and a somewhat feminine pursuit: incomparably better suited to some feminine gifts, than to the gifts of the other sex, the sex supposed to be devoted to business, to real work, to the work of sawing wood, as we say, to the work of real achievement, of discovering north and south poles, the sex supposed to be devoted to science and to action.

Well, to return to Plato's argument for feminism:—whether it be good or bad—I am not called upon here to discuss that question—at least, gentlemen, it is very academic: it is all general principle, the principle of equality; the academic and Platonic mind overlooks the prosaic and unprincipled arguments of expediency, of detail, and of compromise; and this is just what Aristotle retorted to Plato:—nothing is so delightful to me, sir, as to see the business men of Toronto listening to a controversy between Aristotle and Plato—(laughter)—of course I am only going to quote these great men; it would be madness in me, a worm of to-day, to measure or appraise their wisdom, especially when they disagree!—"I don't dispute, then," says Aristotle, drily, "the equality of women: I don't deny even that there are societies, where

they are absolutely equal in their political functions with men: you will find some such societies, Plato, I think,"—there is a certain dry vivacity in Aristotle—"in Central Africa! but the analogy of the lower animals does not hold: civilized man is a monogamous and house-building animal: some one must stay at home and manage his house, while he works outside: who else can do it half as well as woman?" And so Aristotle drops the subject with a prosaic reference not to principle but to expediency: he was not an idealist like Plato, but an exponent of the sober facts of ordinary life; not so much a philosopher as a man of facts and of the world.

In the third place—a third illustration of the love of the academic mind for general principles—no one can doubt that the immense growth of Socialism to-day is due largely to the academic mind: to its love of logic and order and system: the idea of State control, of paternal government, of centralization, appeals to the idealist; the license, the chaos, the anarchy of individualism, where each man goes his own way, works out his own salvation, or drives nails into his own coffin at his own sweet will, offends the man of logic and order and system: liberty and individualism are the negation of system; slaves are free, out of business hours at least, to go to the devil as they please, to sprawl in the sunshine and get drunk; but rational citizens should do everything by system, should be nails and rivets and wheels in an ordered and unified machinery, where there is a place for everything and everything in its place; a great organism working smoothly with no waste, every part in motion, and no movement unnecessary, all in motion to the same principle and to the same end: the control of everybody and of everything by the State is the ideal of Plato and of many modern academic minds: therefore many academic people are Socialists.

I have taken as a type of the academic mind the passion for three large ideas—peace, equality, socialism: there are other features, no doubt hardly less potent and patent in that mind. Which brings me to my second landmark in this survey of the academic mind in politics.

When a nation is in the mood for change, says John Stuart Mill somewhere, the best minds lead the van of the new movement, but the second best, the average good minds—like the second best soldiers perhaps—form the rear guard, criticising and resisting movement, like the Spartan Amompharetus at the battle of Plataea, or in other words the best minds are formative, reforming, original, constructive; the second best, and the majority of good minds, are critical and

negative and contradictory and reactionary and conservative. John Stuart Mill said somewhat the same thing on another occasion in a more popular fashion and in better known words: "all stupid people," he said, "are conservative" (laughter), and Liberals ever since then have been very careful that Conservatives should not forget this; but they generally find it convenient themselves to forget that Mill was a philosopher as well as a radical, and that he added: "and all sciolists and half-educated people are Liberals." (Laughter.) That second proposition of Mill's throws a flood of light on the first: it shows why the second best mind is so contradictory and reactionary. Well, now, I will not say that the academic mind is stupid and therefore conservative; but there is nothing that it hates more than the gush and the confidence and the blather of the half-educated; and naturally so, because it is very critical and contradictory; but there is no fun and no merit in criticizing and contradicting stupid Conservatives who don't profess to be clever or to know much, who like to stick blindly to their habits and traditions, and to feel that they are just where their fathers were before them, or at least just where they have always been themselves—"here am I, same as I was fifty years ago when a boy" is the Conservative cry, and there is no fun in contradicting people like this; and so the academic mind criticizes and contradicts instead the sciolists and the half-educated people and the Liberals. (Laughter.)

The academic mind, I mean, is generally critical and negative and contradictory; the second best, not the best kind of mind; (naturally there are very few of the best minds at any one time in the world, either in the Universities or elsewhere). Of Voltaire it was said: "*il a plus que personne l'esprit que tout le monde a*"—he possessed and condensed in himself the spirit of his age: he was not only the child but the very voice of his age, the bellman of his age; but there cannot be many Voltaires in any nation. The academic mind is rather the mind of Carlyle or of Ruskin, the railing voice which scoffs at the age and scorns the age and rages at democracy the more eloquently and the more bitterly as democracy grows stronger; all satirists and humorists and wits, who being satirists, humorists and wits have not much faith in human nature, but a keen eye for its absurdities and its self-deception, and its conceit of knowledge without the reality, have been, with hardly an exception, conservatives and critics. They have the academic mind. All the Saturday reviewers and many of the world's historians have followed Aristo-

phanes and Cervantes, and have broken their jests upon the idealists and the reformers and the dreamers. "Lord Lytton," said an emancipated lady whom he had had the privilege to take in to dinner somewhere, "how can you be a Tory? All fools are Tories." "True, madam," replied Lord Lytton sadly, "but then all asses are radicals." (Laughter.) The academic mind like the apostolic suffers fools gladly; one is in decent company with the fools; no one can object to people so modest, silent, and faithful to the past; but the academic mind loathes asses: people who think they know without knowing, who make up for want of knowledge by strength of tongue and lung, and bray (when they have ceased, it may be, to pray) without ceasing. (Laughter.)

I have been speaking of the critical attitude of the academic and literary mind; of its dislike or distrust of the spirit of the age, and of such new ideas as are everywhere in the air and everywhere becoming popular; of its reaction towards lost causes and impossible loyalties. But after all, the literary and academic mind is human, and being human it likes to have new ideas of its own, and to make its own discoveries, and to start new political or literary fashions of its own, especially if they be strange to the ordinary mind and very unpopular; these new fashions in literature or politics, I mean, have at least this in common with academic conservatism and academic resistance to the time-spirit, that they have in them the same element of contradiction, or resistance to the popular. I think I can give you some concrete illustrations of this special variety of contradictoriness of the academic mind, that starts some new and impossible cult, of this love for new but already lost causes and new but equally impossible loyalties. There was lately written a book by an eminent Oxford scholar on "Politics and Monarchy," in which he proposes a new and extraordinary scheme for the government of the Empire,—he would unite all the parts of the Empire in an Imperial federation, which should be governed by the King himself! Here is a most promising academic cause surely: a cause lost before it is even born: a cause offering splendid material for impossible loyalty.

As another example,—this time from literature, rather than from politics—there was an American poet, or alleged poet at any rate, who ran counter to all the old ideas of poetry and started a new style of his own, which looked to other people like bad prose, and therefore was called by its author a new style of poetry. (Laughter.) You recognize, I see, Walt Whitman (the least of whose offences was to call him-

self "Walt," when all sensible people so-named call themselves "Walter). His own countrymen, those masses of business-like and matter-of-fact people, were on the whole rather ashamed of him; but some English academic persons and literary men, on the lookout for a mare's nest, took him up and discovered him and made a cult of him, just out of contradictoriness, to show their superiority to the judgment of the public, and now we have in literature this disease which may be called *Whitmania*—just the product of academic and literary perversity! (Laughter.)

I have been talking, gentlemen, of the foibles of the academic intellect: of its weakness for dazzling generalities, for general principles, for cosmopolitanism, equality, socialism: secondly, of its contradictoriness, of its dislike and distrust of popular half-knowledge; of its reactionary conservatism as against the popular spirit of the age; thirdly, of the same contradictoriness displayed in another form, in the form of novel theories political or literary, which have the same quality, that they contradict popular taste and popular opinion, and are just as unpopular as the old-fashioned politics which the academic reactionary loves to defend.

Yet after all, gentlemen, the academic mind is not seriously out of touch, probably, with the commercial or business mind in politics, with the mind I see before me: it distrusts just as much as you do the real elements of danger in our politics,—those catch words, those watchwords, those shibboleths or gags of the newspapers on both sides, those bogey words which beset and besot our country about election times:—you all know them,—we have all of us burnt our fingers at those fires at some time or other; on the one side "patriotism," "loyalty," "pro-Boer," these are the cries which are used as bogey words; and on the other side "tribute," "conscription," jingoism." I have chosen three on each side, and I will suggest a seventh—a seventh candle—the mystical number seven—and I will leave it to you to decide, each for himself, which side abuses it most, uses it most as a bogey word: the mystical and blessed word "emergency" (laughter)—the modern and up-to-date "*Mesopotamia*" of the old lady. These bogey words beg every question, on which they are brought out, darken counsel with hot air and words without knowledge, settle nothing, but raise a dust and din to confuse the issue and blot the sun out of the political heavens and confuse simple hearers: nay, they do far worse: they discredit democracy, and make it seem in danger of becoming the most futile, and the most foolish, and the most un-

manly and contemptible form of tyranny, the tyranny of half-baked popular phrases. It is inevitable when the country is young, when democracy is young, when education is young, when everything is young, and therefore raw and crude in proportion as it is eager and hopeful, it is inevitable that that this danger should arise; but woe to the newspapers and yellow journals which trade upon these catchwords! (Applause.)

Well, Mr. Chairman, I apologize for this diatribe. We have had two political addresses lately, one on each side; so I thought the Club might bear another on neither side; therefore I have tried to-day to pour a little oil on the troubled waters of politics, to administer a little oil to each side, and, if you please, a little vinegar also, to improve my salad;—professors are a simple folk, and live largely on salads, (laughter)—so I serve a little academic salad, just to relieve your intellectual palates, troubled, it may be, on two recent occasions, by a diet too highly spiced, too heating, too stimulating, for the digestions of a Club, so simple in their tastes and food as the gentlemen I see before me. (Long applause.)

(April 14th, 1913.)

Iceland and Canada.

BY PROFESSOR W. H. SCHOFIELD.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 14th April, Dr. Schofield said:

Your Honour, Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen,—It is indeed a great pleasure to hear such courteous words as your Chairman has just spoken. I thank him, and I thank you, gentlemen, for your friendly reception. May I also add a word of thanks to your Hon. Secretary, Mr. Wilson, for his kind letters which just made me feel that my presence among you was really desired.

It is now over twenty years since I left Canada for the United States, and I have enjoyed many privileges and pleasures during my connection with Harvard University; yet I confess I never cross the border to this my native land without a genuine feeling of elation. There must be something down deep in one's heart to make this natural; it was established in my boyhood, and has been confirmed by my steadily-growing confidence and invincible faith in this our Dominion. I say "our" advisedly, for, despite many temptations to the contrary, I have still the honour to be your fellow countryman. (Applause.) More and more Canada seems to have the power to rivet affection and establish loyalty, affection and loyalty which are not incompatible with similar sentiments for the land where her sons may happen to dwell, let alone to the Mother land to which they eagerly cling. Winds of distrust blow at times over every people, but, if I mistake not, high-minded Canadians are now particularly filled with reverent hope. You revere the traditions of European culture upon which your civilization is based, but you aspire to full participation in American progress. Sometimes, when disturbed by

* Professor William Henry Schofield is a Canadian who has attained eminence in educational circles abroad. He was born at Brockville of U.E.L., stock and has been identified with Harvard University since 1897., first as instructor and professor in English literature, and since 1906 as head of the Department of Comparative Literature. Under the German Emperor's plan of exchanging German and United States university professors, Dr. Schofield lectured at Berlin University in 1907-8. One of his works is "English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer," and he has written widely on Danish and Scandinavian literature.

the turmoil or crudity of the new world, we hasten to the old hoping to find solace and repose there, but it does not take us long to discover that on this side of the water is our true home, that hopes have been born within us which we can realize only here, and few properly-constituted persons born on this continent turn back to the West—sail into the sunset—with a glad heart.

To-day I should like to tell you a little of a land from which in the year 1000 sailed to the West, this same West, the enterprising men who first discovered Canada and, as has been conclusively shown, reached no farther south. It is not, however, because of this fact of history, nor for the further historical fact that recently a larger body of men have emigrated from Iceland to our own Northwest, and made their presence felt there in intellectual as well as in other ways; it is not primarily for these reasons that I associate Iceland and Canada to-day, but for matters of the spirit, because I feel that there is much that we can learn from the ancient Norse now that we, in much the same mood as they long ago, have begun to build up a new cohesive nationality, which may attain similar distinction for unique quality.

Iceland, gentlemen, is a dangerous topic to let a lover of that land get launched upon. I remember well that when I first projected a visit there, I wrote to the Rev. Stopford Brooke, asking him whether he would rather I should call upon him in England before or after the trip, and he implored me to go to see him before, since, he said, if it affected me like others of his friends, I should be simply intolerable afterwards. I would talk of nothing else. The other day, Mr. Bryce, our Ambassador in Washington, told me at length of his journey there some thirty-five years ago and maintained that it was one of the most memorable experiences of his life.

Iceland appeals to travellers for various reasons. Sportsmen go there because of the splendid fishing for salmon and trout. (If I had time, I could tell you many stories of our achievements along that line, some of which would be true.) (Laughter.) Yachtsman, go because it is a very picturesque cruise; artists, for fine landscapes to fix on glowing canvases; men of science, to study the geysirs, glaciers, volcanoes and other natural objects of wonder; linguists, to master the most complex extant form of our old Germanic speech; and plain literary fellows like me, apart from a sheer love of adventure and beauty, because we are deeply interested in the Eddas and Sagas, and hope better to understand the environment of those men of distinction of the past whose lives are there set down.

A little girl in Boston, when she heard we were going to Iceland, remarked that she thought Icelanders must resemble native Bostonians, for they were cold and distant. (Laughter.) It was because we had the feeling that it might be cold there, and in any case knew it was distant, that we made elaborate preparations. Finally, we took ship at Quebec on the 1st of July, and sailed to Liverpool. Nine days later we went on board a little Danish trading steamer of about 1,000 tons at Leith. The first day out on our voyage north we suffered a good deal, for the boat kept going "wop with a wiggle between" in the troughs of a vicious sea, but then the weather improved and we enjoyed the rest of the sail. On the fourth day we were roused very early in the morning by the shuffling of feet on deck, and divining what had happened, we hurried from our bunks. Already those who had preceded us had sunk into silence, and we spoke from the first only in subdued tones.

One first view of Iceland, we agreed, was unforgettable—the variegated, escarped cliffs beaten by the foaming blue sea, immense glaciers pushing down from far-away summits to the very waves, a brilliant light spread over all. It was stimulating, mysterious, quieting. Iceland! No wonder it was so called. It matters little where he who established the name first saw the shore. One might have got the suggestion anywhere. Let one leave the great Vatnajökull, the largest glacier in Europe, which we were viewing in the south, and travel around the coast to the west where on a projecting point beautiful Snowfell, rises nearly 5,000 feet, amply justifying its name, or farther on where in Icefjord magnificent fields of white reach from water to cloud, or still farther on in the north to the harbour of Akureyri, where even in midsummer Arctic floes sometimes prevent a steamer's entrance. Even in the interior as well as on the coast there is ice and snow in view. Plainly this is Iceland. Yet only in neglected regions of volcanic ruin does the ice repel. Throughout the island abound green pastures. In among austere crags and lava washes are fascinating fjords and delightful waters. Iceland has always been able to inspire love more than awe, yet both at once in the same heart. Far to the west, in 982, an outlawed Icелander discovered a region with broader tracts of ice, more barren and bleak, yet, in order the more readily to promote travel thither, called this place Greenland. But though there may be much for the moment there is nought in the long run in a name. "Greenland's Icy Mountains" we now sing about as an ultimate of unappealing space; but Ice-

land's green valleys breed more and more longing in those whom they have once thrilled. It is only the ignorant whom the name sets shuddering.

It was in 860 that a Norseman discovered Iceland, but it was not till 874 that the Norse emigration thither really began. Political conditions in Norway helped the movement. Then King Harold the Fair-haired was trying to extend his dominion in all directions, but the vigorous chieftains of this land resisted obstinately, until, when nothing else availed, they determined to leave their homes. Some went to the Orkneys, Faroes and Shetlands; some to Ireland, where they founded Dublin, and held sway for three hundred years; others went to Northern Gaul, and founded there the dynasty from which came the vigorous Norman Dukes and English Kings; while many made their way to Iceland, to build up there a republic, the like of which has never been seen elsewhere in the world.

These men were democratic aristocrats. To them Iceland was a sweet land of liberty, where they felt they might live without tyrannical overlord and worship what gods they would undisturbed. And there they had the joys of upbuilders, of rescuers of waste places, of creators of a new democracy. In 930 they adopted a constitution for the whole island, and from then till 1262 Iceland was a republic with an elaborate system of representative government the enlightenment of which under the circumstances modern writers on jurisprudence unanimously applaud.

It is narrated that when the first settler was nearing the land he threw overboard the sacred pillars of the high-seat he had brought from his Norwegian hall, and let them drift ashore, trusting himself thus to the guidance of the gods as to where he should reside. These pillars escaped from his view, and he decided to make a temporary abode on the southern coast, but later he discovered them in a sheltered harbour around the desert point in the southwest, and there he "took land," as was said, and established a colony. There were many hot springs in the neighbourhood emitting clouds of smoke, and from this prominent feature of the landscape he called the place Reykjavik, "the vik, or bay, of smokes." Reykjavik, at present the capital of Iceland, though beautifully situated, did not commend itself to us, and we immediately prepared to depart for the interior to visit prehistoric natural wonders and mediæval saga scenes. We were ten in all, including four guides, and we had thirty-two horses. It took us some time to get used to the discombobulating jog of

our ponies, which had never learned to trot properly. (Laughter) Our sleeping packs were placed on either side of the pack-horses' saddles, and they were allowed to run loose, except in places where it was necessary to go in single file, when they were sometimes tied to one another's tails.

We had not gone far in the direction we first took before we observed certain physiographical features to which I shall briefly refer: Iceland has the geographical uniqueness of being the most fiery within, and the most frigid without, of any land on the globe. It contains no less than a hundred and seven volcanoes, twenty-five of which have erupted within historic times. Lava covers one-fifth of the island, and just by that one-fifth Iceland is larger than Ireland. To traverse these lava-fields is not, however, so tiresome as one might think, for the soil is all so fantastic in form that the scene never lacks interest. Everywhere little caverns are visible, and certain large ones, over a mile long, in which outlaws lived of old, appeal strongly to the imagination. There are no trees in Iceland, but one does not feel oppressed by monotony on that account since great wealth of colour vivifies the rocks. Many travellers to Iceland have commented on the resplendent sunsets they found there, but to me Icelandic day-gleams were more beyond the power of words to depict.

As a result of the island's volcanic nature, one expects indications of inner turmoil. Most conspicuous of these are the so-called geysirs, or bubblers, mysterious wells, whence water is projected high in the air by subterranean forces. The largest geyser has a conical opening about twenty yards wide. To stimulate it to activity we fed it seventy pounds of soap; but, the weather being cold, it did not respond for several hours, about midnight, and even then it sent the water to a height of only about fifty feet, while at other times it had been seen to go up to a hundred and fifty feet. Near this great geyser are nearly 100 boiling springs; but the most interesting perhaps are at Reykir, where some are yellow or green in colour, one enormous bowl a glowing pink.

Geysirs, little or big, did not fill me with the awe they have done some folk, but I confess that those sulphur pools at Reykir fill me to this day with foreboding and unrest!

A large proportion of Iceland is covered with glaciers, and from these flow many chalk-coloured rivers, which are extremely destructive and dangerous. I remember one in particular in the south. We traveled for several hours along its bank, till we came to a point where we thought it might be possible to cross. We then secured four extra local guides

and pushed in. Since the bottom often changes, the head guide never crossed any one of the twenty-two streams without examining it carefully. One frequently felt as though one's horse had lost his footing and was being swept away, but that was only because the water was rushing so rapidly past. It was with a distinct feeling of satisfaction that after an hour I saw the last one of our party ascend the hither slope, and we then watched the pack wind like a serpent along the route we had ourselves come.

I wish I could tell you the history of the place we were then seeking in pilgrimage, the ancient home of Gunnar the Brave, but of that you can read in the *Saga of Burnt Njal*, a brilliant narrative of particular interest to lawyers. Then, I recall, our tents blew down, and our aluminum poles were twisted into unrecognizable shapes, so that we had to take refuge in the church. It was not the first or the last time when we were in Iceland that we were invited to use churches as places of shelter. On such occasion we took in our sleeping-bags, inflated our rubber mattresses, and then tossed up to see who should occupy the Epistle side and who the Gospel side of the chancel; then we lay down and slept like saints. In the morning we took turns dressing in the pulpit.

Though not the largest, Hecla is the most famous of the volcanoes of Iceland. It is impossible now to give you an adequate idea of our ascent or of the view from the summit of that great fiery furnace, where the fires still burn low in obscurity. Mistral maintains that Dante got the suggestion of his Inferno from the wierd rocks about Les Baux in Provence. But had Dante looked out from Hecla he would have painted a picture of a different kind. One does not wonder that Icelanders conceived a hereafter of cold torment. As one gazes to the east over the limitless glacier washes one recalls how Odin conjured up the Sibyl to tell the fate of Baldur the Good. Like the Witch of Endor wailing "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?" she rose at his command, and thus spake: "I have been snowed on with snow, beaten with rain, dripped over with dew, dead was I long." Natives still people the land with giants and trolls.

To me, however, the most impressive place in Iceland was Thingvellir or Plains of Parliament, where for nearly 1,000 years representatives from all parts of the country gathered in midsummer to adjust disputes and to determine the laws of the land. The legal system of this early republic was extraordinarily complex. The old Icelanders had a positive genius for jurisprudence, and some of their enactments amaze us by

their modernity. The place itself is magnificent—a broad lava field which has sunk down, and in its subsidence left great rifts on either side. Through one of these a river runs. Near by is the chief lake of the island. All around are snow-covered peaks. At Thingvellir there never were conspicuous habitations or halls. Here, if anywhere, one might say:

“Not to the domes whose crumbling arch and column
Attest the feebleness of human hand
But to that fane most catholic and solemn
Which God hath planned!”

Here is a place of natural majesty and marvel where no sort of human architecture would seem to fit. I felt, with Lord Dufferin, that it would be worth while to travel back to Iceland if only to spend another day on that spot.

The district of greatest charm in Iceland is the west coast, with its deeply-indented fjords, lovely valleys, and gleaming waterfalls. Here above all are the scenes of the Sagas. Here were enacted those events which reveal the spirit of the inhabitants and have made the history of Iceland for ever memorable.

Outer conditions made it impossible to build enduring buildings in Iceland. Outer conditions, especially after the Danes came and exploited the island, deprived it of all prosperity. Outer conditions, plague pestilence and famine, have more than once reduced the peasants to extreme poverty and distress. But outer conditions at their worst have never been able to conquer the pride and virility of this race. There is at present not a single illiterate person in the island. (Applause.) The men are earnest, self-reliant, eager for knowledge, and impatient of vice. They cherish with zeal the records of their past. Though subjects of one kingdom or another for many centuries they seem never to have lost the democratic spirit of their ancestors in the days of their independence. At present, to be sure, the land lacks all marks of outer distinction, but it could not have been always thus. Undoubtedly the mighty have fallen, but elsewhere it has been the same, and the marvel is that the mighty of Iceland endured so long.

Wherein did the greatness of ancient Iceland consist? If I mistake not, chiefly in three things: amplitude of vision, fortitude of character, and honesty of heart. It is primarily because of these things, these matters of the spirit that I have ventured to associate Iceland and Canada in my remarks to-day, for I am convinced that if Canada is to attain to the same inner greatness, along with her vastly greater outer pros-

perity and power, she, too, must have, more and more, amplitude of vision, fortitude of character, and honesty of heart. (Applause.)

"Little does the man seem to know, who knows only Iceland," said a Saga-writer of old. And little does a man seem to know who knows only Canada. In order to be truly great, one must transcend the limits of locality, get out of parochialism and provincialism, and learn to comprehend the ways of other men and other times. Twenty-five years ago, it seemed to some of us that Canadians, as a whole, were but dimly conscious of the fact that there was a world elsewhere. Most seemed content to live humble lives in a comfortable colony. The United States, to which so many of the ambitious went, seemed like the Celtic other world, "a land from which no stranger returned." Why, indeed, should they—when there was opportunity for effort, prospect of preferment and, above all, understanding of ideals? There a man might hope to participate in, to realize—the world elsewhere.

Amplitude of vision! By that, gentlemen, I do not mean mere practical far-sightedness, but rather that spiritual amplitude of hearth and home, that power of discernment which may come simply from reading and reflection but which establishes permanent standards by which men and measures may be judged. Yet that alone is insufficient. Success in ideal struggle means personal fortitude, and only by being true to oneself can one be true to one's neighbour and one's nation. It is by the measure of the individual that the nation is great.

We are here in a land which has received the name—to me a happy name, one in any case that is likely to last—"Our Lady of the Snows." This name brings to mind the holy, gentle Virgin and evokes the mood of tender Christianity. "Our Lady of the Snows" seems to smile winsomely, inspire consecration, and point to honour in peace. (Applause.) She wears an altogether different mien from the Valkyrie, heathen goddess, whom one may imagine as hovering over Iceland from her cradle-days. Odin's messenger, fateful, unfaltering, firm, Valkyrie, chosen of those who, when doomed to die in conflict, passed straightway to Valhalla there to keep strong *for ever*, each day measuring their might.

For ever! That idea dominated the thoughts of the ancient Norse—"Lasting is the doom over a dead man," we read in the Lay of the High One, expressing a conviction of power. I have many times seen upon banners "Canada for ever!" But I have often questioned whether we Canadians

were individually doing what we must in order to make our deeds deserve to last for ever. To make Canada distinguished in the eyes of the world—for ever—we need more and more in ourselves amplitude of vision, fortitude of character, and honesty of heart. These will always make for liberty under the law, distinction in restraint, and achievement that is lasting because true! (Applause.)

(April 21st, 1913.)

The Value of Playgrounds to the Community.

BY MR. JACOB A. RIIS.*

AT the last regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, for the season of 1912-13, held on the 21st April, Mr. Jacob A. Riis said:

Mr. Chairman, Your Grace, friends and neighbours across the line,—They say that a man and a people live in their ideals. If I should apply that to myself, I must begin very far back. For my own ideal, and that of the friend here on the right who has been telling me of your housing movement in Toronto, is the man in the garden. I suppose that conception goes back to the Garden of Eden. We take it for granted that if a man is planted in a garden on his own plot of soil he cannot go far away from what is right. As a theory that is all right; in practice the ideal has been knocked on the head several times in my own home, for one thing in the case of Philadelphia, which is a city of homes, yet for years held the evil reputation of being the worst governed city in the land. But the hardest blow it received on this side of the line, and I will risk telling you how. I used to come with a couple of friends to spend part of the summer in your beautiful and wonderful wilderness of the north. We came year after year, and we enjoyed ourselves tremendously. We always had the same old man for our cook and his son for guide. The old man,—I will call him Donald,—that is not his name, but I want to save his feelings, was a Scotch Presbyterian, of the most uncompromising kind. He would discuss infant damnation and foreordination and the other grim old doctrines in the way that was distinctly good and whole-

*Mr. Jacob A. Riis, is a social reformer and slum-cleanser of international reputation. A Dane by birth, he early emigrated to New York where as a police reporter for the *Sun*, he became interested in tenement conditions and in East Side abuses generally. He has been instrumental in the creation and spread of the playgrounds movement and dwelling-house reform in many cities all over the continent. His fidelity to the cause of the under-dog is indicated by the number of books which he has given to the public among which we find "How the Other Half Lives," "The Children of the Poor," "The Battle of the Slum" and "Children of the Tenements."

some for us. I gloried in that man and his splendid piety. Aleck was just a scallawag of the frontier with no principles to speak of. One day Aleck and I were fishing, and he fell to telling me how the votes in the little hamlet on the edge of the wilderness in which they lived were all bought by one party or the other, I never knew which. It seemed to me a ridiculous and scandalous waste of money, to buy *all* the votes, when a little more than one half would have done! (Laughter.) And I said to Aleck, "Aren't you drawing the long bow?" "Oh, I guess not," he replied. "I ought to know, I held the bag." "Does it occur to you," I asked, "that when you said you were buying all the votes you implied that you were buying your own father's too?" "Why not?" he said, "shouldn't he have his two dollars the same as the rest?" (Laughter.)

I said no more, but when I saw the old man that evening, I took him to task. Donald was much annoyed, shrugged one shoulder, then the other, and said, "Those young fellows' tongues are too long! They talk too much." "That is not the point," said I, "did you or did you not take the two dollars?" He looked at me as if lost. "Why, yes," said he, "the money was there, I might as well have it as the rest of them." And then he saw something in my face, and reassured me: "But that is all right Mr. Riis. I took the money, but I voted for the other man!" (Laughter.) And I thought of the definition given by Matt Quay, chief of corruptionists, of an honest man, as "one who would stay bought!" (Laughter.) Ever since I have stood in awe of the Presbyterian conscience.

But if the man in the garden proved a delusion, it must be because we didn't begin far enough back. Hence we have taken our stand with the boy in the playground. That is solid ground! (Applause.) And I think I shall prove it.

It was not always so. It is not more than thirteen or fourteen years since I went before the Board of Education of my city, begging them to open one playground at least for the boys, to take them off the street after school hours. When after half an hour's plea I had finished, they thanked me and said they were glad I had taken all that trouble, "but you have not told us where there is anything educational in all this. (Laughter.) If you can show us that, perhaps we will do it." That was at the outside fifteen years ago! Last week, or the week before last, I met Dr. Maxwell, the Superintendent of our schools, and asked him, "How many school playgrounds did you maintain last year in connection with the

schools, not in school hours but in the long vacation." "Two hundred and twenty-two," he said. (Applause.) And he might have added, "In another five years we shall have four hundred and forty-four, in all probability!" and not have been far out of the way.

And while we have done that, two great sovereign States, Massachusetts on the Atlantic seaboard and Washington on the Pacific, have passed laws requiring cities of ten thousand inhabitants or over to maintain playgrounds at the public expense. That law was referred by Massachusetts to the people themselves to confirm, and there was something to me of grim humour in the fact, when last year I was campaigning in that State, and saw the dread sane good people had of the referendum. They had themselves wielded that power a little while before to the great and lasting advantage of the commonwealth. And now we have come to the pass where at a playground congress the cry was raised: "Rather a playground without a school than a school without a playground!" That time the pendulum swung too far, as it is apt to do. We want them both and so hitched together as to do the boy and us all good.

Now what does all this mean? It means that we are at last awake to the fact that the boy is father of the man, of the citizen of the to-morrow, and that there is no shorter way that you can possibly take to the corruption of that citizen than to deny the boy his childhood. For, friends, you can't make a whole man out of half a boy! (Applause.) No boy is ever more than half a boy who has not had his chance to toss a ball across the lot unchallenged. There is an unsuspected connection between lack of play in young years, child labour, and trampery. It is a surprise to many people, yet it is perfectly natural. Take a boy, and jam him into a factory, —at thirty you have a spent man! 'The boy without a playground is the father of the man without a job.' Force him into a shop in his young years, when he should be out at play, and he will be the father of the man who doesn't want a job!

Seventy-five years ago, Friedrich Froebel, of whom you all know, but of whom the Board of Education of my city did not know fifteen years ago, laid down as the foundation pillars of his system of common sense education, whether of rich or poor two rules: one, that play is the normal occupation of the child, through which he gets his first grip on moral relations—that is: grows character—what in all the world could be more "educational" than that which gives the

image of God in him a chance to grow into manhood? (Hear, hear.) The other is that you learn by doing and not much in any other way.

What does the boy learn whose playground is always set between two gutters; and whose only game is "getting arrested?" Take your own city. A man who is here to-day told me of a boy who came to this city from Scotland, where he had lived in a village, and in a few weeks appeared in the Juvenile Court charged with mischief, smashing street lamps and windows. They found out that he lived in a dark cellar that palled on the boy who was used to outdoor life, had lived in the hills; so he took to the street, and of course he got into trouble with the police. Unconsciously that gentleman told me the whole story of the slum and the hoodlum. He was sent up to the Industrial School for three years. I hope your Industrial School is better than some I know of, for otherwise you may have done yourselves and that lad an irreparable injury. (Hear, hear.)

He goes to play in the street; he does not mean to break lamps and windows, but a ball has ways of its own, and damage is done. Naturally the storekeeper kicks, and the policeman is not to blame; he has his orders. What those orders ground in, you may understand when I tell you that I happened across the figures of street traffic accidents in New York City for the year before last: between two and three hundred persons were killed, and between ten and eleven thousand maimed. So there is good cause to deny him that playground. But the boy does not know it. He breaks a window, is chased by a policeman, and he runs. His little legs can go faster than the policeman's and he gets away. And while he runs with his heart hammering up under his shirt, he swells with pride at having beaten the policeman. That is the beginning of outlawry. The policeman chased him over the line.

Forty years ago the Earl of Meath, on the other side of the sea who has thrown much light on this question of juvenile delinquency, pointed out that crime in our large cities is to the greatest extent simply a question of athletics, of giving the boy a chance. What is a boy anyway but a little steam boiler, with steam always up! (Laughter.) I pity the boy who is not built that way, who has not the steam boiling and bubbling in him! The boy has a safety valve: it is his play. You can sit on the safety valve of a boiler with steam up if you want to, but you are an awful fool if you do! Something is bound to happen! And what else have we done in our large cities? We see signs, "Keep off the grass!" The

grass is sacred in our cities, but the boy is not! He can go to the devil if he chooses, and he has been going there, hot-foot.

We had a small Parks Commission in our city, and I was the secretary. I was a police reporter at that time in New York, and I stood at the wicket gate where the whole procession of rapsCALLIONS passed through. I had a map drawn of the city, and where the worst gangs were which made trouble I stuck pins. We called in the police captains of those districts, and asked them how they accounted for the lawlessness there and what made the trouble. As one man their answer was, "The boys haven't any chance to play!"

There were the tenements with the biggest crowds, that means with the largest number of boys. Also, they were the newest tenements. Within my own recollection there had been vacant lots. Don't I still hear that objection, "What is the use of playgrounds? We have vacant lots?" But the city grows, and the lots are built upon, until there is not one left. And as these playgrounds are narrowed there is more peril to windows, and the trouble with the policeman begins, and the trouble with the storekeepers. The boys feel that they have been imposed upon. The Constitution of my country says that every man is entitled to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The boy's play is his happiness. It is in these neighbourhoods the trouble begins. When we tore down blocks of tenements and made playgrounds, the "gang" disappeared. Those playgrounds cost us a million dollars a block of three acres. One thing we have learned is that it is cheaper,—and I give this advice to you for what it is worth,—it is much cheaper to make playgrounds when the ground costs a thousand dollars than to wait till it costs a million. (Hear, hear, and applause.) We not only paid a million dollars for playgrounds when we pulled down the tenements, but we also took a million dollars' worth of property off the tax books, so that it hurt both ways. And still it was cheap.

The "gang" is the outcrop of the fact that there are no playgrounds. In Chicago, whenever they put down playgrounds in a disorderly neighbourhood, twenty-five to thirty per cent. of the juvenile delinquency of that neighbourhood ceased! The President of the Board of Police Commissioners of St. Louis wrote this very pregnant sentence: "Ninety per cent. of habitual criminals start their careers before they are ten years of age." That is the whole story in a nutshell! Speaking out of my own experience as a police reporter I would say the same. The pregnant hours of a boy's day are

between seven and nine o'clock in the evening; between supper and bedtime. If you know where your boy is then, and what he is doing, you have got your boy; if you do not, look out!

That, in brief, is the story of the playgrounds, which we have learned in our big city. Of course we needed to learn it more than any other city in the world, for we have the biggest crowding, and in an "environment that made all for unrighteousness and tended to corrupt the young," the Tenement House Commissioner said that indictment woke us up and since then we have been paying for our past neglect, paying hard and high! Now we have learned that lesson. See what has come in the track of it: the war on child labour, juvenile courts, probation officers, "Big Brothers"—the biggest and best part of the probation officer movement! and what are all these but plain justice to the community?

Other things have come, are coming. Ten or a dozen years ago I used to come across the despairing wail that "the cities are the peril and the scandal of our democracy." An author whose book I came across the other day piped a new note: "the cities are the hope of our democracy," he wrote, and the man was right. We have turned the corner as to that. (Applause.)

Look at our new way of dealing with our school houses. We are using them not only as civic centres, but as social and political centres as well. Last year I spoke in more than one big beautiful schoolhouse in the Bull Moose campaign, if you please. Ten years ago when I proposed that, I was called a hopeless crank. To-day we are actually rediscovering the lost neighbour. They used to wail that the town-meeting, that was the simplest and most direct expression of our democracy, was gone. Yes, it went, for it could no more exist in our day of city crowding than the old-fashioned mechanic in our age of steam industry. But with the schoolhouses become social centres, with neighbour meeting neighbour in their own house for the discussion of public problems, the old town meeting has come back in a way that fits into our city civilization as the old one did not, and could not. So that grief is gone.

The need of playgrounds is everywhere realized. The Vice Commissions point out that the young seek bad pleasures very largely because good ones are denied them. Of course the city fathers are slow to provide these, because they are the guardians of the public funds; but they will learn, too, that it is cheaper to pay \$1,000 than \$1,000,000. Only absolute

ignorance protests. Last summer I was surprised to find a man rise up and protest against this "interference with the rights of the boys," as he put it, "to sow a few wild oats." His objection was not only to the playgrounds, but to the juvenile court and to the probation officer. He said: "First thing we know, we shall have these probation officers gathering in the children because they fail to attend school!" (Laughter.) That would interfere, he thought, with the inalienable rights of poor children! That is only one of the shadows that throw the lights of the picture into greater relief.

Apropos of schools, let me give you a point. When we could not buy ground space for play, we put the playgrounds on the roof, four stories up, and invited the children in. And they came. We were busy with many things and assumed as a matter of course that they were hard at play up there, when one day there comes before the Board of Education a petition from the janitors of all the schools which had roof playgrounds, asking the Board to discontinue them because "they were not much used!" That was a very astonishing thing, and I said to the President of the Board of Education, "Let us go to-night and see what this means." We went to one of the schools and found hundreds of children swarming in front of it. They came up to us, pleading, "Won't you take me in?" "Sure! Come right in!" we said. But as we approached the door, they began to hang back. Suddenly out from the doorway rushed a man with a big stick,—*"B-r-r-r-r!"*

We asked him what that meant, and he said it was the janitor's orders. The President held a court martial right there, and we found that the janitor, not desiring to clean up after so many little feet, had placed his assistant at the door, with orders to hit the children on the head with a stick when they tried to get in. So he was enabled to report after a while that "the playgrounds were not much used."

As a result of that night's work, the Board ordered the stringing of electric lights on the roof, and there in the long summer evenings there comes a band to play to the children, and if you saw them, three or four thousand of them, dancing to the tune of "Money Musk" or "Way Down Yonder in the Cornfield" (applause), you would think the millennium had come. And so it has. My point is: "don't forget to enlist the janitor."

We spend a fortune for music and play, hundreds of thousands of dollars, and it is well spent. In Chicago they provided 27,000 plates of ice cream for the school play-

grounds, at five cents a plate. When I think of what that means, I feel that life is really worth living.

I talked of supervision. One word more: When you achieve your playgrounds, friends, make up your minds that they are not going to be cheap. The cost of the ground is by no means all there is to it. Face that boldly. You have to have supervision. Not enough to spoil it. The instinct of the pedagogue insists on classifying, and organizing the play into team play and group play, and heaven knows what, and to what grave scholastic ends; to fill it full of views and aims, until the boy won't know it for his own. Let him alone. Let him kick up his heels and run in the sunshine like a young colt. If he comes home bringing back a bruised nose and a black eye, all right!—a black eye may be a prime moral agent! But let the play be guided and overseen; let there be a mature intelligence behind it, that helps the child to his needs. Don't put a policeman in charge! (Laughter.) That is bad. To put nobody in charge is worse.

Then, when you have done all this, be sure that it will repay you a thousand times in the days coming, in good citizenship. Don't you know, that at a certain age every boy in the world is on the fence, and doesn't know which way to jump? When my boy was six years old I used to see this little man slyly feeling of his muscles, and one day he had got hold of a household ammonia bottle and torn off part of the label. When I passed his room I found he had pasted on his chamber door "William Riis, VERY STRONG!" (Laughter.) That lad was coming into his rights. One day he said to his beloved mother, "Mamma, would you be very mad if I should be a burglar when I grow up?" "A burglar," she exclaimed, "Why Billy! and be arrested! why, the police would get you!" He thought soberly a minute, then said, "Well, then I will be a sailor?" And his mother pleaded with him not to leave her for the dark and cruel sea. "Well," he said, "what shall I be then? A boy can't always be nothing at all!" She put in her plea for the ministry. She would so like him to be a little minister. (Laughter.) The Archbishop will forgive me for this reference, I am sure, he was such a little boy—well! he didn't like it a bit. His face was like a thunder cloud; but at last he surrendered. "All right," he said. "If I can't be a burglar, and you won't let me be a sailor, then I will be a minister, when Mr. Evans goes away!" Mr. Evans is our rector, and every time I feel he needs chastening, I tell him that story, how my boy took to the ministry as third choice! (Laughter.)

The point I want to make is: this lad was on the fence; every boy of his age is on the fence, if he is the kind of boy that is worth his salt! (Hear, hear.) Now, our function is, to help him get off on the right side of the fence! (Applause.) And the very best way of doing that is to give him the play he needs and hankers and yearns for! (Long applause.)



F
5547
T6C33
1912/13

Canadian Club of Toronto
Addresses

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
